NELSBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE series of theological text books known as the 'Duckworth Studies in Theology' has proved itself a great friend to students. In its list of books are many which have earned their place in the curriculum of theological colleges. New volumes, which continue to be added to the series, are chosen with commendable discernment. The latest volume is not unworthy of its predecessors, and offers readers a clear, orderly, concise, yet comprehensive presentation of its subject. The title is *The Interpretation of the Bible* and its author is Professor James D. WOOD of the Scottish Congregational College, Edinburgh.[1] A sub-title describes it as a 'Historical Introduction,' and that well fits the contents, since the book aims rather at presenting the methods used to interpret the Bible from the earliest times to the present day than at convincing the reader of any one correct way.

The book deals with what is a very live issue for our own time. Thirty years ago students were taught to regard the Bible as an unfolding revelation, leading up to the fulness of truth in Christ, but retaining much which, in the light of final truth, was not only inadequate but even false. The Old Testament was emphatically subordinated to the New. The so-called Biblical Theology of the present time, however, approaches the Bible in a different way. It is as a whole the Word of God. Human reason, perverted by sin, must hesitate to pass judgment on it. The unacknowledged assumptions which led earlier scholars to discard unwelcome parts of the Bible are exposed and criticised. A new kind of Fundamentalism appears. Still a further mode of interpretation lies before us in Bultmann's plea for 'Demythologising,' in order that modern man may penetrate to the inner message of the Bible. Still others revive the ancient method of typology and allegory, sometimes to an extent that borders on the fantastic. It is curious that such diverse exponents of the Bible all find in it the source of ultimate spiritual truth. It is as though there is some abiding value which reaches the humble reader through the Bible, in spite of the various ways which he may adopt to deal with its difficulties. Professor WOOD's book, therefore, deals with a very relevant topic of discussion.

[1] Duckworth; 10s. 6d. net.

He reminds us that 'interpretation is the exposition of the writer's meaning in terms which are intelligible to the modern reader,' and insists that such interpretation is even more necessary to-day than it was in the time of the Early Church, because for us the Bible is an *ancient* book.

The author describes the methods of interpreting Scripture, which were used among the Jews at the time of our Lord. He contrasts the new insights which Jesus brought to this written word, and also the methods used by Paul, other New Testament writers and also the Apostolic Fathers, for whom the recognized Bible was still mainly the Old Testament. The 'mystical' approach of the Alexandrians, with their delight in 'typology' and 'allegory', is contrasted with the strong preference of Antioch for the literal and historical sense. Origen, for instance, held not only that the Bible is inspired, but also that it contains nothing unworthy of God, and that everything in it has a figurative meaning. His insistence on the 'figurative meaning' enabled him to accept passages which otherwise would have seemed 'unworthy of God.' At Antioch, however, the literal meaning of Scripture was given a greater control over figurative interpretation, though typology was not forbidden, provided that it was strictly related to the literal sense. This Antiochian tradition did not gain general acceptance in the West, but through its influence the literal interpretation was assured a place in the life of the Church, though often it was dangerously subordinated to 'spiritualized' interpretations.

Jerome, Augustine, and Aquinas come under review, and are allowed to offer their own contribution, often in their own words. So we come to the Reformers, for whom the Bible was the chief authority in spiritual matters. Professor WOOD believes that it was Luther's realization of the meaning of 'the righteousness of faith' which became the key to his interpretation of the Bible's message. This realization came to him 'by a divine illumination,' bearing the direct authority of God. Everything else in the Bible must therefore be in accord with it. What appears to be unconcerned with this key-emphasis is of secondary importance. Moreover, for Luther, only what treats

of Christ is essential, and even books in the New Testament which do not pass this test are relegated to a lower level of significance. Professor Wood comments : ' Luther interprets the Bible in terms of religious insight and with a Christological application.' ' His interpretations are governed by his theological convictions.'

' Calvin is the greatest or one of the greatest interpreters of the Bible.' In practice he interprets the Bible in its plain, literal meaning, though he realizes that the literal meaning on occasion may itself be allegorical. He criticises Origen for ' torturing the Scripture away from the true sense.' He is quoted as writing : ' Scripture, they say, is fertile and thus produces a variety of meanings. I acknowledge that Scripture is a most rich and inexhaustible fountain of all wisdom ; but I deny that its fertility consists in the various meanings which any man, at his pleasure, may assign. Let us know, then, that the true meaning of Scripture is the natural and obvious meaning ; and let us embrace and abide by it resolutely.'

Zwingli's characteristic emphasis is to insist that each part of the Bible is to be interpreted in the light of the whole. ' The Bible, as God's Word, is its own interpreter.' A passage is to be interpreted in the light of its context and by the help of kindred passages. Moreover the humble believer may grasp its meaning even without any priestly explanation, but he must bring true faith to the task : ' God's word can be understood by a man without any human direction : not that this is due to man's own understanding, but to the light and Spirit of God, illuminating and inspiring the words in such a way that the light of the divine content is seen in its own light, as it says in Psalm 35 (A.V. 36) : " For with thee, Lord, is the well of light, and in thy light shall we see light." '

The Council of Trent, seeking to correct the errors of the Reformers, recognized the authority of ' all the books of both the New and the Old Testaments, since one God is the author of both,' but insisted that to the Church alone belonged the power rightly to interpret them. In response the Anabaptists asserted, sometimes extravagantly, the right of the individual to interpret Scripture for himself, and claimed that the Inner Light, which came from the Holy Spirit within the believer, enabled him to understand the written word. Among British writers Milton exemplifies those who insist on the right of the individual as an interpreter of the Bible. He wrote : ' Although the external ground which we possess for our belief in the written word is highly important . . . that which is internal, and the peculiar possession of each believer, is far superior to all, namely the Spirit itself.'

Before we reach the modern period we learn the views of Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Schleiermacher and Coleridge, and others. Among present-day writers Barth, Dodd, Snaith, Hebert, and Thornton are cited. Among these we find the emphasis that the Bible must be allowed to speak to us its own message, and interpreters must refrain from forcing alien philosophies upon the message of the Bible. Moreover there is a new willingness, as compared with a generation ago, to recognize a deep underlying unity in the Bible, rather than to emphasize the variety of its points of view.

If we wish to learn how the Bible has been interpreted by leading figures in the life of the Church down the ages, we are not likely to find a clearer or more concise account than this book provides. Moreover we are given not just the author's judgment on the men and their opinions, but verbal quotations from the original sources, from which our own judgments may be formed. We frequently meet such long and ugly words as ' allegorical,' ' typological,' ' anagogical,' and ' tropological,' but very wisely the author prefaces his book with a glossary in which these verbal riddles are graciously resolved.

The size of a book has little to do with the importance of a book. There is no more important subject in all Christian thought and practice and devotion than *Koinonia*, and in a little book of thirty-five pages — *Members One of Another : Aspects of Koinonia*[1] — the Rev. J. G. Davies, M.A., D.D., has dealt greatly with a great subject.

Rightly Dr. Davies begins very far back. It is nothing less than the Incarnation itself which is both ' the foundation and the primary expression ' of *koinonia*. In the Incarnation ' there is thus a *koinonia* of man and God in Christ which is the direct outcome of God's condescending and creative love '. It is to be noted that this is what we might call—Dr. Davies does not himself use the word—an ' essential ' *koinonia*. ' The New Testament is not concerned with a man who was elevated to the Godhead, but with the living God who descended to manhood.' It is, therefore, of paramount importance to understand that *koinonia* is not, and cannot be, the creation of man, but of God. ' It is not a collection of folk associated because they share a common interest in religion, but the society or fellowship—or even body—of

[1] Mowbray ; 3s.

those whom God has called into *koinonia* with Himself through His Son and in Him with one another. If the relationship between God and man has been transformed by the coming of Christ, so too has the relationship between man and man. The *koinonia* has an horizontal reference simply and solely because it has a vertical one.'

But Dr. DAVIES pushes things—again rightly—even further back than that. 'At the basis of the *koinonia* between man and God in Christ is the *koinonia* of Father and Son.' Because Jesus is man, through the Incarnation our manhood is taken up into the Godhead so that we may become 'partakers in the divine nature' (2 P 1^4). It is Jesus' prayer that His people may be one even as He and His Father are one (Jn 17^{22}). 'This *koinonia* in and with God has been made possible through the historic mission of Jesus in whom exists the *koinonia* between God and man. The *koinonia* is, therefore, a life shared by God with man and by man with God. God is its source and He imparts this life to us in and through His Son.' So, then, Dr. DAVIES leads us into the meaning of *koinonia* by rooting it in the very life of God Himself.

Dr. DAVIES then goes on to deal with the *koinonia* of the Spirit. Here he has certain things of first-rate importance to say. First, we participate in the Spirit, when we enter into the *koinonia* of all believers. 'The Spirit's presence is never an individual possession to be enjoyed in isolation, but the bond of unity of the Body of Christ through whom the faithful are united to one another and to Christ.' Second, participation in the Spirit is 'interpreted' eschatologically in the New Testament. The coming of the Spirit into the Church is two things. It is a sign that the *eschaton*, the end time, is at hand. And it is also a foretaste, and earnest, a first instalment of the life of the age to come. Third, *charismata* are the gifts of the Spirit. But these gifts come within the Christian community and are for the use of the Christian community. 'They are not given to the individual to glorify himself but to serve the people of God; they are not endowments for individual self-expression nor are they primarily concerned with fostering the individual's relation with God but with furthering the moral and spiritual health of the Body.' These points are well made and well worth making.

Dr. DAVIES' third chapter is concerned with the *koinonia* of the Body and the Blood. In the Eucharist we enter into the *koinonia* between God and man, and, therefore, into *koinonia* with one another. Here there emerges a most important point. We must avoid what Dr. DAVIES calls a 'liturgical Pietism'. The *koinonia* established at the Lord's Table must not cease to be *koinonia* when we leave the church building. It must make us members one of another in all our daily life, and in all our social relationships. This means that 'if we are to present the New Testament position, we can make no essential difference between worship and daily life'. *Koinonia* is derived from the adjective *koinos*. Now *koinos* in the Old Testament describes that which is *not* holy, but which is *common* or unclean. 'In the Old Testament there is a rigid dichotomy between the common and the holy.' That dichotomy is well exemplified in the courts of the Temple which isolated the Holy of Holies and which were aimed to preserve it from contamination with that which was *koinos*. 'But when God entered into *koinonia* with man in the Person of Jesus Christ all that was *koinos* was hallowed.' '*Koinonia* no longer exists on two levels, the religious and the secular, since both are one through Christ.'

Still further—and this is intensely relevant to-day—that *koinonia* must be an all-embracing thing, through which indeed it can be said: 'See how these Christians love one another'. 'Indeed', says Dr. DAVIES, 'a right understanding of *koinonia* only serves to throw into greater relief the scandal of our schisms, but if this, in turn, impels us to a greater effort towards reunion, then it can be said to be of the utmost contemporary value and importance'.

Finally, Dr. DAVIES turns to the *koinonia* for the Saints. Here we may simply note that *koinonia* must issue in *diakonia*, in the Christian service which is the outcome of Christian love. *Koinonia* is not Christian sentiment or emotion; it is Christian action born of Christian love. These addresses of Dr. DAVIES were originally given at the invitation of the Division of Inter-Church Aid and Service to Refugees of the World Council of Churches at their annual Consultation in June 1957. And it is obvious that they could have been given in no more appropriate setting.

Dr. DAVIES generously acknowledges his debt to D. F. Hauck's article on *koinonia* in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, and to L. S. Thornton's *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*. He has made available to us the deep material of these works but in his borrowing of it he has greatly enriched it. This little book is a work of real importance; it will deepen the mind and kindle the vision of all who read it. Seldom have wealth of scholarship and practical challenge walked in closer *koinonia*.

Paul's Certainties

VII. Our Security in God—2 Timothy i. 12

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., The University of Glasgow

'I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.'

In a series such as this we cannot totally ignore the fact that this passage is taken from a letter of which the Pauline authorship is questioned; but also in a series like this it would obviously be out of place to argue the case for and against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. We, therefore, briefly state our own position on the matter and say no more about it. Lock in his commentary on *The Pastoral Epistles* writes: 'If they were not written as they stand by St. Paul, they probably incorporate some earlier notes of his; the whole was written by one who thought himself a devoted follower of St. Paul, whose mind was steeped in the very language of St. Paul's letters, who has tried to express his spirit; and this attempt was accepted by the Church as true to its memory of what St. Paul had been and taught' (Walter Lock, *The Pastoral Epistles* [*I.C.C.*], p. xxxi). With that view we agree; and, whatever else we may say, this passage has in it the mind of Paul.

The very language which Paul uses here is a resounding declaration of faith. In the Greek the phrase 'that which I have committed' is in fact one word, the word *parathēkē*. *Parathēkē* was a word with a certain nobility in it. It gathers up within itself all that the finest of ancient thought regarded as honour and honesty. *Parathēkē* (in classical Greek more commonly *parakatathēkē*) means *something which has been deposited or entrusted.* The typical picture in the word is that of a man going upon a journey and depositing with, and entrusting to, a friend his most precious and valued possessions. To be faithful to such a trust, and to return such a deposit unharmed, were amongst the highest and most sacred obligations which ancient thought recognized. A man so trusted was under the most binding legal, moral and religious obligation to fulfil the trust placed in him.

The matter is provided for as far back as the Code of Hammurabi, which dates as far back as 2200 B.C., and in it the necessity of fidelity in the return of pledges is laid down (§§ 122–126; C. H. W. Johns, *The Oldest Code of Laws in the World*, 23 f.). The matter is dealt with in the Old Testament, and the legal and religious penalties for failure in such a trust are set out in detail (Ex 22^{2-13}, Lv 6^{2-7}).

The Greeks too regarded anything which had been deposited as a trust as the most sacred of obligations. There is a Greek story which occurs more than once in classical literature. In Sparta there lived a man called Glaucus who had a reputation for justice. To him there came a man of Miletus, who had turned half his fortune into silver, and who wished to entrust it to Glaucus' charge. So he left the fortune, and gave Glaucus tokens by which the right claimant to the fortune might be recognized when he came to claim it. The years passed on, and in due time the two sons of the man of Miletus came to claim the fortune which had been entrusted to Glaucus, bringing with them the tokens which established their identity and their right to the silver. Glaucus declared that he had no recollection of the transaction, and asked for four months to try to bring it back to his memory, if indeed it had ever happened at all. Glaucus well knew that he ought to restore the silver. He consulted the oracle at Delphi as to what he should do; and the oracle gave him a dreadful warning of what must happen to the man who broke his oath and failed to return that which had been entrusted to him. In terror Glaucus sent for the two sons of the man of Miletus, and forthwith returned the silver to them. But none the less disaster befell him. 'There is at this day no descendant of Glaucus, nor any household that bears Glaucus' name; he and his have been utterly uprooted out of Sparta. So good a thing it is not even to design aught concerning a trust, save the restoring of it on demand' (Herodotus, vi. 86; cf. Pausanias, II. xviii. 2; VII. vii. 8; Juvenal, xiii. 199–208). The Greeks and the Romans set in the very forefront of duty and obligation the return of an entrusted pledge.

When Pliny was telling Trajan of the apparent harmlessness and innocence of the Christians, he said that they affirmed that they 'bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up' (Pliny, *Letters*, x. 96).

To the ancient world there was nothing more

sacred than the duty to return that which had been entrusted, and to return it in safety. It is this very duty that Paul places upon God. 'I am quite certain,' says Paul, 'that God will keep that which I have committed to His keeping, that I can trust God to safeguard the *parathēkē*, which I have deposited with Him.' If such a duty was obligatory on a man, how much more was it obligatory on God?

This idea was by no means strange to Paul, for more than once Paul had thus entrusted his converts to the keeping of God. The verb which is connected with *parathēkē* is *paratithesthai*, and twice Paul uses this word of entrusting his converts to God. After the first missionary journey Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in every Church through which they had passed, and, when they had prayed and fasted, they *commended* (*paratithesthai*) them to the Lord (Ac 14^{23}). When Paul took his last farewell of the Ephesian elders, he said to them: 'And now, brethren, I *commend* (*paratithesthai*) you to God' (Ac 20^{32}). Paul handed over his converts as a sacred trust to God.

What, then, does Paul mean by this *parathēkē* which he has entrusted to God? Some think that here, too, he refers to his converts, and that he is handing them over to God in sacred trust. There is at least something to be said for that interpretation. The verb *paratithesthai* has three extremely interesting usages. It is used of handing children over to a ward. It is used of handing scholars over to a teacher. And in particular it is used in connexion with the manumission of slaves (J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, under the word *parathēkē*, p. 483 f.). In the Greek world a slave might acquire freedom by becoming the property of a god. The slave saved every possible penny that he could. As he saved the money he deposited it in the temple of some god. When, after laborious years, the slave had saved enough to purchase his freedom, he took his master to the temple. The money was handed over and paid to the master, and thereupon the slave became the property of the god, and, therefore, free of all men. At such a time the slave was said to be handed over *en parathēkē*, in sacred trust, to the god. The responsibility for the slave then fell upon the god. It might well be that in using this word Paul was meaning that, when he was gone from this earth, he was calling upon no other than God to be responsible for the converts whom he had won.

Some think that what Paul is referring to is his teaching and his gospel. Again this is by no means impossible. The Pastoral Epistles do in fact call the body of Christian truth which is passed on from generation to generation the *parathēkē*. Timothy is urged to keep the *parathēkē* which has been committed to his trust (1 Ti 6^{20}). He is urged to hold fast the form of sound words, the good thing, the *parathēkē*, which was committed unto him by the Holy Spirit (2 Ti $1^{13.\ 14}$). The Christian faith is a sacred trust which is committed to each generation, and each generation must protect the faith, and hand it on. It has been deposited with them, and they are responsible for its transmission in purity. It might well be that Paul, before he passed from the scene of history, is committing his teaching and his gospel to God, that the Holy Spirit of God may protect in the future what He has given in the past.

While we do not say that these interpretations are impossible, we think that Paul is here meaning nothing less than his own life and his own soul. He has committed his life to God as a sacred trust, and he is certain that God will protect in time and in eternity that which has been entrusted to Him. There are two other New Testament uses of the word *paratithesthai* which seem to us to make this interpretation well nigh certain. It is Peter's advice that those who suffer for the faith should *commit* (*paratithesthai*) their souls in well-doing to God, as unto a faithful Creator (1 P 4^{19}). Peter is telling his friends to entrust their souls to God, and God will never fail in that trust. The other use of this word is in a saying of Jesus Himself. The last thing that Jesus said on His Cross, according to Luke, was: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Lk 23^{46}). The word for 'to commend' is *paratithesthai*. Jesus committed His life to God in sacred trust; and Paul is doing the same in words which are a reminiscence of the words of Jesus.

It is worth while remembering what these words of Jesus were. They are a quotation of Ps 31^{5} with the single word 'Father' added. Now it has been said that Ps 31^{5} was the first prayer that every Jewish mother taught her child. Before the threatening dark came down, the child was taught to pray: 'Into thine hand I commit my spirit.' It is the entrusting of life to God. It may be that Paul is not thinking only of the words of Jesus, but that he is also remembering the first prayer he ever learned to pray.

By the very use of the word *parathēkē* Paul is declaring that he is entrusting his life and soul to God. That word stood for an obligation which no honourable man would ever break. How much more could Paul be confident that God would never betray the trust reposed in Him? Here, indeed, Paul affirms our security in God. Whence, then, comes Paul's conviction of his own and of the Christian's security in God?

1. It comes from Paul's overwhelming sense of *the reliability of God*. There is an adjective which Paul more than once uses to describe God, and in

itself it is a declaration of belief. It is the adjective *pistos*. In its active sense *pistos* means 'believing,' and is not so common; in its passive sense *pistos* means absolutely trustworthy, absolutely reliable, absolutely dependable. It is used of an advocate whom his client can trust with complete confidence to protect his interests. It is used of a slave who will never play truant and who will never run away, and who can be relied upon to do the work that has been given him to do. When Paul calls God *pistos*, he means that we can unhesitatingly depend and rely on God to carry out the promises He has given.

Paul uses this word *pistos* of God in three connexions. (1) He insists that the God who called us is completely to be relied upon (1 Co 1^{9}, 1 Th 5^{24}). We can depend on the God, who called us to carry out the purpose of His call. He will not forget; He will not leave the matter half-finished; His power will not fail and His love will not change. We can rely on God to finish that which He has begun in our lives. (2) We can rely on the God who directs and controls and guides life. We can rely on God to see to it that we are never tested above what we are able to bear, and always with the testing to send the way out (1 Co 10^{13}). We can depend on God to send us no experience which is beyond the bearing. (3) We can rely on God to keep us steadfast in the faith (2 Th 3^{3}). It is often easy enough to begin a thing, but hard enough to finish it. God is not only the God of the new beginning, He is also the God of the long road. We can depend on Him not only for the initial thrill and the final glory, but also for the long, and often weary, road of the way between. So, then, Paul is convinced that the Christian life is begun, continued, and ended in the conviction that we can utterly rely on God.

2. It comes from Paul's conviction of the effective power of Jesus Christ. 'He is able,' says Paul. The word which Paul uses for 'able' is very significant; it is the word *dunatos*. In secular Greek *dunatos* is the word for an 'able-bodied' man, for a 'powerful' argument, for a ruler or a nation 'mighty' in word and action, for ground that is 'fertile' and 'productive.' In every case the idea in *dunatos* is that of *effective power*, power which can produce results. In the New Testament itself the word is quite commonly used of persons. Moses was *mighty* in words and deeds (Ac 7^{22}); Apollos was *mighty* in the Scriptures (Ac 18^{24}); the preacher must be *able* to exhort men truly (Tit 1^{9}); the brother who is *strong* must always be mindful of the brother who is weak (Ro 15^{1}); Paul uses it of himself, when he speaks of the grace which makes his weakness *strong*. Once again the idea is that of *effectiveness*, the ability to produce results. But we can go further than that. *Dunatos* is used of Jesus, when the two men on the road to Emmaus speak of Him as a prophet *mighty* in deed and word (Lk 24^{19}). But, above all, the word takes its flavour from the fact that it is the adjective of God. Paul uses it quite simply of God's power (Ro 9^{22}); of God's power to graft in again the branch which has been cut off (Ro 11^{23}); of God's ability to perform that which He has promised (Ro 4^{21}); and in Lk 1^{49} God is called *ho dunatos*, the Mighty One. When Paul takes this word and applies it to God in Jesus Christ, he is triumphantly affirming his conviction that God is not only powerful but also that in Jesus Christ that power has become *effective towards salvation*. Who can doubt that which is promised and guaranteed by the effective power of Almighty God?

3. It comes from Paul's *experience of life*. The significance of any statement depends on the experience of the man who makes it, and the situation in which he finds himself, when he makes it. If a man, on whom the wind had never been allowed to blow, declared his sense of security in God, it would not mean very much. If a man who had never glimpsed the open sea, a man who had never known the valley of the deep, dark shadow, a man who had never known the tears of things, a man who had never known blood, and sweat, and tears, proclaimed his comfortable assurance of the general safety of life, it would be neither impressive nor effective. But Paul was a man who had crowded more adventures and hairbreadth escapes into his life than a score of other men (2 Co 11^{25-27}). He was a man who had wrestled with a life-time of pain (2 Co 12^{1-10}). If we reckon up Paul's journeyings, we find that even the distance from place to place is more than six thousand miles—all done on foot and in little ships. And at this very moment he is completing four years in prison, and looking forward to a trial which can hardly have any other issue but death. It does mean something when a man with that experience can say that God works all things together for good (Ro 8^{28}). Paul's conviction of our security in God came from the best of all evidence. It came from the fact that he had faced everything that life could do to him, and he was still upon his feet, and still serenely unafraid. Paul would have known what Rupert Brooke meant when that young poet, going out to death, wrote:

> Safe shall be my going,
> Secretly armed against all death's endeavour;
> Safe, though all safety's lost; safe where men fall;
> And if these poor limbs die, safest of all.

4. Still further, Paul's sense of security was founded on *a personal relationship*. As has often been pointed out, the one word which is the salient word in this whole passage is the word *whom*. Paul

does not say : ' I know *what* I have believed ' ; he says : ' I know *whom* I have believed.' This translation is retained by the R.V. and the A.R.S.V. Moffatt, and C. Kingsley Williams (*The New Testament in Plain English*) both have ' I know whom I have trusted.' Weymouth has ' I know in whom my trust reposes.' J. B. Phillips has, ' I know the One in Whom I have placed my confidence.' It is these two last translations which really come at the meaning of this phrase. The verb for ' believed ' or ' trusted ' is a perfect (*pepisteuka*). The aorist in Greek denotes one action, completed and done in past time. The perfect denotes an action which has resulted in a state which continues and lasts to the present time. Paul is not speaking of an act in the past, an occasion when he believed in Jesus Christ. He is not speaking of intellectual assent to a proposition, or even of religious acceptance of a creed. He is speaking of nothing less than a personal relationship, once entered into and for ever continuing. It has been truly said that none of the apostles ever *remembered* Jesus. They lived with Him. He was not a memory of the past ; He was a presence in the living present. The most characteristic phrase in Paul's letters is the phrase *in Christ*, which occurs more than seventy times. For Paul Christianity meant being *in Christ* ; and his sense of security came in his sense of union with the living Christ. The highest value in life consists in personal relationships. It is the simple truth that our ability to cope with life often—perhaps always—comes from our fellowship with some one who is very dear to us, and to whom we can turn when life becomes too much for us. But in life it is inevitable that such a relationship must come to an end by the inevitable interruption of death. It is not so with Jesus Christ. With Him we can enter into a personal relationship which is independent of time and which is untouchable by death ; and in that relationship there is the security which nothing in life or death can destroy.

5. This brings us naturally to the last thing Paul has to say about our security in God in this passage. *It is a security which transcends this world and which embraces eternity.* What Paul has entrusted to God is safe *against that day*. No Jewish thinker in New Testament times ever escaped from the basic Jewish belief about time. The Jew divided time into two ages. There was this present age, which is wholly bad and which is beyond mending ; there was the age to come, which was wholly good and which is the age of God. The one could never become the other by any process of evolutionary development, or by any achievement of man. The only thing which could effect the transformation was the direct action of God. The Jewish belief was that God would intervene in history. The time of that intervention was the day of the Lord. The day of the Lord would come with suddenness ; it would be a cosmic upheaval in which the world was shattered and destroyed (Jl 1^{15} $2^{1.2}$ $2^{30.31}$, Is 13^{9-13}, Am 5^{18-20}, Zeph 1^{14-18}). But the supreme characteristic of that day would be that it would be a day of judgment. In that day once, finally, and for all God would destroy His enemies and gather in His own. Even in a crashing world into which there came the avenging holy wrath of God, Paul knew that he was safe, not through any merit of his own, but because of the work of Jesus Christ for and in his soul.

For Paul the security in God covered life and death and life after death. It meant security in all the chances and the changes of time and in the judgment of eternity. Through Jesus Christ Paul had entered into a relationship with God which nothing in time or eternity could destroy. It was a security as indestructible as God Himself.

Literature

ANGLICAN CRITICISM

The title of this interesting and stimulating collection of essays—*Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism*, edited by the Rev. David M. Paton (S.C.M. ; 25s. net)—might lead one to suppose that it would contain an exposition of the shortcomings of the Establishment as experienced by the clergy and laity in their every-day life and work in the Church of England. But it is not this kind of book at all. In the first place the contributors are not all Anglicans ; the very important subject of the Mission of Anglicanism is dealt with by a distinguished Free Churchman, Principal John Marsh of Mansfield College, Oxford, and Professor T. F. Torrance of New College, Edinburgh, and what they have to say, however justified, about the shortcomings of the Anglican Church can hardly be called ' self-criticism.' Secondly, the majority of the essays direct their criticism, not so much at the Anglican Church as at the entire Christian Church facing outward towards a non-Christian world.

The book is really a very able Frontier and Ecumenical manifesto, and as such is worthy of the close attention of all Christians, and not merely of Anglicans. It is incumbent on us to listen to what the Spirit saith unto the churches.

The two essays on the Mission of Anglicanism contain the most direct criticism of Anglicanism. Principal Marsh acknowledges that he is writing 'in the wider context of the Ecumenical Movement of which Anglicanism and Congregationalism are part and to which each has given so much.' After an able historical sketch of the conversations between Anglicanism and Nonconformity, the author comes to the issue of the elements in Anglicanism which hinder the Church of England from fulfilling her ecumenical mission. With regard to Rome he regards the issues confronting her as 'somewhat small,' being mainly the fact that many Anglican priests celebrate and 'incline very much toward Roman sacramental views, and the revival of Thomist metaphysics.' With regard to the issues between Anglicanism and Nonconformity the author considers that the question of episcopacy is the most serious obstacle to the union of Christians outside Rome. He is hopeful about the outcome of discussions between Anglicans and Free Churchmen on this problem, and is of the opinion that 'Anglicans are not committed to any one view of the nature of episcopacy'; but while all would agree with him that 'an academic debate on episcopacy will produce little result, but only a humble, honest, repentant attempt to secure the unity of Anglican and Free Churches,' yet one cannot help feeling that the author has passed very lightly over the fact that for many Anglicans the theological issues involved in the nature of episcopacy are too vital to be sacrificed even for the sake of unity. Nevertheless, Dr. Marsh thinks that the most likely place in which to seek a solution of the problem of episcopacy is in the possible discussions between Anglicans and Free Churchmen.

In the second essay on the Mission of Anglicanism, Professor Torrance, speaking from the point of view of the Church of Scotland, comes out, as might be expected, more strongly on Anglican intransigence in the matter of episcopacy. He says that 'Anglican isolation of and stress upon episcopacy, together with this self-consciousness of a special Anglican mission, has in spite of itself driven it more and more toward being another denomination, and is depriving it of the influence both upon the masses of common people and upon other Churches which in different ways it strives so hard to wield.' This is frank criticism from a friend, and many Anglicans, though certainly not all, would acknowledge the justice of it. There is much else worthy of comment in this thoughtful essay, but one more point may be mentioned. Dr. Torrance sees among the hopeful signs in the movement of the Anglican Church a commendable tendency to emphasize the importance of the ministry of the Word, as well as of the Sacraments.

It is impossible to discuss all the seventeen essays of this stimulating symposium, but two call for special note before we bring this review to a close. One is the essay by the Rev. M. J. M. Paton entitled 'Can We Ignore the Establishment?' It is one of the essays which does offer the self-criticism promised by the title of the book. It is a scholarly and incisive exposition of the merits and defects of Establishment, and in the author's view the balance inclines towards disestablishment.

The other essay is by the Rev. A. M. Allchin and deals with the relations between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy. In it he defends the thesis put forward by Professor Hodges that, in the split between East and West, there were questions of faith at stake, and that it was the West which was in the wrong. The concluding sentence of the essay may well serve as the conclusion of this review: 'As we gradually break down the barriers between East and West we shall find that we are also able to free the Church from its identification with the Western, or any other, way of life, so that it may be seen more clearly for what it is, the new and redeemed people of God, which can enter into and transform the life of any nation or civilization, but which is in the end independent of them all.' S. H. Hooke

---

BIBLICAL CRITICISM

Professor Wick Broomall thinks the time has come for the conservative scholar to be aggressive, and so he has written an aggressive book under the title, *Biblical Criticism* (Oliphants; 17s. 6d. net), which will be highly valued by all who prefer *a priori* views of the Bible to views based on its patient study. Much of the book is devoted to a defence of the theory of the verbal inspiration of the Bible. The author declares (p. 60) that the Bible is verbally inspired. He will have nothing to do with any recognition of the spiritual authority of the Bible that is not tied to its infallibility in all respects, and he says (p. 71) that those who reject an infallible Bible are likely candidates for the Church of Rome. He recognizes (p. 72) that a formidable objection can be raised against him on the ground that we have not the original autographs for which infallibility is claimed, but disposes of this by declaring (p. 73) that it is possible for us to reconstruct the original text of Scripture and to ascertain what was in the original autograph copies. It is much easier to make this assertion than to address oneself to the laborious study of textual criticism, which must disillusion any honest student. It is true, as the author states

(p. 73), that most of the variant readings do not affect fundamental doctrine. But whereas this is important for the view of inspiration, against which Professor Broomall is so aggressive, it is irrelevant as a defence of his own view. There are many citations from the Old Testament in the New which differ from the passages as they stand in the Old. Both cannot be equally valid witnesses to the original autographs of the Old Testament passages, and Professor Broomall's theory involves the assumption that God Himself did not know what text He had originally inspired. The study of the Old Testament quotations in the New is a salutary discipline. Again, the Old Testament plainly says that Abram left Haran before the death of his father (Gn 11^{26} 12^{4} 11^{32}), and there is no question of textual uncertainty here; the New Testament equally plainly says (Ac 7^{4}) that it was not until after his father's death that he departed. Both cannot be infallibly correct, and it is wiser to abandon a theory of inspiration than to charge God with error.

The author does not shrink from misrepresenting those against whom he carries his aggression. He says (p. 152) that the reviewer presents the view that prediction was an insignificant part of the prophet's ministry, that he was more interested in social evils than in prediction, and that when he did make predictions he confined himself to events near at hand. In justification of these statements he refers to the reviewer's 'Rediscovery of the Old Testament,' p. 256. This is presumably to the American edition, and nothing stands on the page remotely relevant to what is here said. Actually, what the reviewer said (p. 150; English edition, p. 105), was 'all pictures of the Old Testament prophets as statesmen and social reformers are inadequate. They are messengers of God'; (p. 152; English edition, p. 107), 'his (*i.e.*, the prophet's) predictions of the future did not spring out of his cleverness in penetrating the secrets time held in store, but out of the clearness with which he saw the present in the light of the vision of God'; (p. 260; English edition, p. 184), 'it is undeniable that beyond their interest in the immediate future that should arise out of the present the prophets cherished the thought of a Golden Age that lay far off in the future . . . and they spoke of a distant future that did not connect causally with the present, a future that should be born of the grace of God rather than of the acts of men.'

It will be seen that Professor Broomall's book is not infallible, and other examples of its fallibility could be given. One only may suffice. He says (p. 183) that the Lachish letters and 'the Ras Shamra alphabetic letters' push back our knowledge of Hebrew to the period of the conquest. The Lachish letters date from just before the fall of Jerusalem to Nebuchadrezzar many centuries after the conquest, while the Ras Shamra texts are not written in Hebrew.

To the reviewer it seems wiser to teach people to read the Bible for what it is than for what it is not, and very unwise to seek to base faith on a preconceived theory which cannot survive examination.

H. H. Rowley

HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY

'Psychology is the most undisciplined of disciplines, the nursery and romping ground of every extravaganza, a Tower of Babel for every known and unknown tongue, a mint for counterfeit and spurious coins, a market-place for every pedlar of far-fetched and unlikely theories. It is an amalgam of humbug, platitude, piercing intuition, naïveté, soaring flight of imagination, dull dogma, incisive reasoning and sheer drivel.'

These are the first two sentences from the Preface of Professor John Cohen's *Humanistic Psychology* (Allen and Unwin; 18s. net). They made me wonder what was to follow in the text. Was he going to debunk the very subject by which he was earning a living? On the contrary we have a fascinating volume, a 'reflection on experience from the inside.' He refuses to believe 'that a knowledge of the brain will eventually tell us all that we need to know about the mind.'

He divides his book into five parts. It is in the first part, where he is looking for a starting point for a system of psychology, that we see how justified those sentences from the Preface are. With acumen and humour he evaporates the bizarre assumptions of the market-place pedlars. He is especially hard on the neuro-physiological school who would reduce psychology without remainder to neural processes. 'The culprits are those who profess to be "psychologists" and are aided by philosophers, whom Sir Russell Brain has described as "making their living by expounding the non-existence of their own minds."'

His own position is clear: 'Our starting point must be the phenomena of experience from the "inside." At the next stage, connexions with the "outside" can be established, thereby linking with the other sciences.'

Beginning with 'The Shaping of the Young Mind,' he takes us through the development of human experience from infancy to adolescence, culling from a wide knowledge of psychology, science and literature apt quotations and illuminating illustrations. He is especially good on 'The Permitted and Forbidden in Childhood,' and expounds the value of 'barriers' without which the growing personality 'would be uncertain whether he was doing right or wrong.'

Space forbids me to enlarge on the suggestiveness of part three, where he discusses 'The Senses as Social Organs,' and 'Psychological Time.' A quotation will be permitted. 'The senses are not biological gadgets for receiving information from the world outside.' 'For it is not the eye that sees, the ear that hears or the skin that responds to touch. It is *we* who see, hear and touch, and we always perceive meaning and value.' No less fascinating is the chapter on 'Psychological Time.' It is entirely 'different from physical time and is subject to variations which cannot occur in physical time.' A sermon is as long as it *seems*!

The connexions with the outside world are seen in parts four and five, where he discusses with a wealth of illustration 'Personal Thinking,' 'Contact of Minds,' 'Work and Play,' 'Psychological Meaning of Illness,' and 'Psychology in Relation to Literature.'

His book, says the author, 'might be equally described as "an elementary psychology for advanced students" or "an advanced text for beginners."' It is more than either. It will grip the intelligent layman, provide psychological insight to the minister, psychiatrist and social worker; and the professional psychologist will read it more than once. It is exceptionally well documented.

JOHN G. MCKENZIE

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

The first French edition of Professor Edmond Jacob's *Theologie de l'Ancien Testament* appeared in 1955. The Strasbourg Professor's book has now been translated into English by Dr. Heathcote and Mr. P. J. Allcock under the title *Theology of the Old Testament* (Hodder and Stoughton; 30s. net).

The introductory chapter gives a summary of the study of Old Testament theology, and shows how towards the end of the last century the temper of the times demanded histories of Israel's religion rather than studies of her theology. Within the last quarter of a century the situation has changed completely; the theology of the Old Testament has ceased to be the poor relation of Old Testament studies, and has become the queen of them all. This is due partly to a number of works on Old Testament theology which appeared almost simultaneously, mostly in Germany but also in Holland and in the U.S.A., and partly to a number of books and monographs which have dealt with certain aspects of Old Testament religion.

The book is in three sections. The theme of the first is that Yahweh is a *living* God, and it is this element of livingness and activity which distinguishes Him from all else. Dr. Jacob discusses the various names of God, His relation to other gods and angels and other powers, which leads on to the manifestations of God to men. We then have six chapters dealing with the attributes of God. The second section deals with the action of this living God: His instruments, His work in Creation, in relation to Mankind, His work as Lord of History and His functioning in Institutions. The last section deals with the opposition to God's work and His final triumph. The opposition, of course, is Sin. The chapter on Sin and Redemption is short, much shorter than one would expect. Probably this is because for the Christian the solution is only suggested in the Old Testament, and we have to look beyond it to the saving work of Christ. Probably, therefore, every Old Testament study of sin is bound to seem inadequate. There is a chapter on Death and the Future Life and a final chapter on the Consummation, under the headings of The Eschatological Drama and The Messianic Kingdom, both of which titles speak for themselves.

A feature of the book which is very useful indeed is the bibliography appended at the end of each chapter, with a specialized bibliography at the end of main chapter divisions. The book is a good summary of Old Testament theology and of what has been written in the last twenty-five years. Most of the important modern studies are mentioned. But no man can put a gallon into a pint pot, and any book on the subject of three hundred odd pages is bound to be a summary. The book is good and adequate, and the frequent, balanced and informative footnotes point the reader to specialised studies where he can follow out the full theme to his satisfaction and further edification.

N. H. SNAITH

THE NEW I.V.F. SERIES

The Inter-Varsity Fellowship has recently inaugurated a new series of well-printed inexpensive 'paper-backs.' Of the first issues the most important is Dr. J. I. Packer's '*Fundamentalism*' *and the Word of God* (4s. 6d. net). Stimulated by Fr. Hebert and others Dr. Packer aims to show, first, that 'Fundamentalism' is a modern misnomer for historic Evangelicalism, and, secondly, that authentic Christianity is a religion of Biblical authority. The argument, developed with clarity and conviction, leads to the conclusion that the current 'Fundamentalism controversy' presents a choice not as between obscurantism and scholarship but as between two versions of Christianity defined by Dr. Packer as 'historic Evangelicalism' and 'modern Subjectivism' respectively. This somewhat radical limitation should not

deter any who dissent from it from the study of a book which grapples with great issues and has much of value to say to readers of many varieties of opinion.

Two other titles illustrate Dr. Packer's main thesis from different viewpoints. The formal aspect is underlined by Dr. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones in *Authority* (3s. net). He approaches the discussion of this important contemporary issue by considering the nature of the authority of Jesus, of the Scriptures, and of the Holy Spirit. The book suffers from being the transcript of addresses given last year at an I.V.F. Conference in Canada. With the possible exception of the final section, it adds nothing to the argument of the former book. Within its own limits it is effective testimony at the popular level. In *Basic Christianity* (3s. 6d. net) the Rev. J. R. W. Stott illustrates the content in a series of studies addressed to the thoughtful inquirer. He begins with a full, clear and persuasive argument for the deity of Jesus. A statement of man's need as a sinner, gathered around an application of the decalogue to modern conditions, leads to an account of the salvation won for us by Christ, stressing the penal interpretation of sin-bearing. A brief reference to the Church supplies an element lacking in the other books. The argument is pressed home with a call for decision and an outline of what it means for one who has become a Christian to be one.

The Story of the Church, by Professor A. M. Renwick (4s. 6d. net), is a simple graphic survey of Church History from Pentecost to the separation of I.V.F. from S.C.M., written from the Protestant standpoint. The proportions of study are in general well maintained with one glaring exception—the virtual exclusion of the Eastern Orthodox. Dr. Renwick would have done well to omit reference to names where there was no space to say anything significant about them.

Though outside the series, *The Lord from Heaven*, by Dr. Leon Morris (4s. net), is published in similar format. It is an admirable survey of the New Testament evidence for the full divinity and true humanity of our Lord. Setting out the variety in approach and language of the writers, Dr. Morris shows how impressive is the fundamental agreement which emerges and provides further illustration of the truth that 'the reality of the creeds lies in that surrender of the soul which precedes their articulate utterance.'

MARCUS WARD

Jeremiah: Prophet of Courage and Hope, by Professor J. Philip Hyatt (Abingdon Press; $2.00), is a small (a hundred and twenty-eight pages), but very readable popular study of Jeremiah. Dr. Hyatt (Vanderbilt University) has been writing specially on this prophet for some fifteen years. There are two appendices, one a suggested chronological arrangement of the Book of Jeremiah, and the other a selected bibliography. Dr. Hyatt provides translations of his own where this is helpful, and provides a vivid setting for the oracles of the prophet. The book is to be commended for its freshness, its clarity, and its sound religion.

There is no longer any need to commend Frederick Denison Maurice to the attention of the present-day reader. We can be grateful to Canon Edward F. Carpenter for re-introducing *Theological Essays* (James Clarke; 15s. net). The brief but adequate Introduction sets the Essays, first published in 1853, in the context of Maurice's life and work, and gives reasons for the judgment that the Essays 'represent an effort by Maurice, in the full maturity of his powers, to justify and to "explicate" the faith that was in him.' They may not be his best work, but they throw light on the man and his motives.

A book that should interest every social student and Christian worker is *Gambling in English Life*, by the Rev. E. Benson Perkins, M.A., LL.D. (Epworth Press; 8s. 6d. net). This is a revised edition of a book published eight years ago. In the interval the barriers against the expansion of the organized gambling trade have been lowered. The lottery laws have been weakened, the State itself with its Premium Bonds has taken a hand and the promise that betting offices are to be legalized indicates that a deplorable trend in our common life is likely to proceed apace. In this edition the statistics and the statement of the legal position have been brought up-to-date. We wish a wide circulation for this dispassionate analysis of a growing menace from the point of view of a Christian social expert.

As background material to thought and prayer for the Lambeth Conference of this year the Highway Press has issued at 2s. 6d. a substantial booklet by the Rev. Gordon Hewitt, entitled *Church of Free Men*. Particular attention is given to the work of the C.M.S. which has had so large a part in the making of the Anglican Communion, and to the concern for mission and unity which has marked the Lambeth Conferences. From the useful statistical tables which are appended we learn that in 1800 there were sixty-one dioceses in the Anglican Communion, of which forty-eight were in the British Isles. The corresponding figures to-day are three hundred and thirty-three and seventy.

Professor T. F. Torrance, M.B.E., D.Th., D.D., in *When Christ Comes and Comes Again* (Hodder and Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net), has published a volume of sermons which he dedicates 'in admiration and encouragement to the Tell Scotland Movement.' The sermons—preached on various occasions—have been rewritten in order chiefly to bring out more fully the theological content of evangelism. There are sixteen sermons arranged under a fourfold grouping—The Advent of the Redeemer, The Word of the Gospel, The Foundation of the Church, and The Faithfulness of God. This is expository preaching over a wide area of theme, and in many respects impressive and rewarding. Certainly in such themes as The Approach to God, The Good Shepherd, The Cleansing of the Fellowship, The Trinity of Love, the evangelistic urgency and tenderness find notable utterance and Biblical girding. On the other hand the theological content has trends and emphases which are difficult if not confusing. One may instance the concern with the Second Coming, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection. Must evangelism in what it has to tell Scotland, or any land, consent to the drastic literalism with which Dr. Torrance speaks here? For the rich content in the book readers will be very grateful; nevertheless there are persistent overtones of fundamentalism in it which will surprise and perplex some of them. Not all of this is encouragement to evangelism.

The National Sunday School Union has just issued a new Hymnary called *Sunday School Praise* (words only, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. net, music edition, 15s. net), containing five hundred and eighty-three hymns and also a few pages of prayers and Bible reading arrangements.

Comparing it with the Church Hymnary, nearly half is identical—the book is no break-away from the mass of familiar church praise. But it contains a large amount of new material, some of the highest quality, designed especially for use by children and youth. The impression of one with no technical qualifications in music is that the music may be judged to be the outstanding excellence of the book, comprising as it does a wealth of old church music and a large number of English traditional melodies and many tunes by distinguished recent and contemporary composers.

It may be a penalty of our church divisions that such a book should not be sponsored by a committee of all the churches. It is a matter for rejoicing nevertheless that so sound and catholic and comprehensive a compilation has been achieved; though it is curious that, while including two communion hymns, there is none for a baptismal service and no reference to the Christian year. The question remains whether it is wise policy, at least after the Primary stage, to train the young in a book dissociated from church worship.

When Dr. Vidler, now Fellow and Dean of King's College, Cambridge, was a Canon of Windsor he had living with him a number of middle-aged men who were preparing for ordination. He was persuaded they should study volumes of sermons to help them to get ready for the preaching ministry. Struck by the present-day scarcity of published sermons, Dr. Vidler felt he could not 'reasonably complain of the failure of other preachers to meet this need unless I try to do something about it myself.'

He has now published a collection of twenty-eight of his *Windsor Sermons* (S.C.M.; 15s. net).

In his Preface Dr.Vidler tells us that he is 'a painful preacher.' The result of his carelul labour is a noteworthy collection of sermons, stimulating thought, speaking to men in their own idiom, and facing present-day difficulties.

By permission of the S.C.M. we have quoted 'The Sign of Cana' (shortened) in The Christian Year section. It indicates the quality of the volume.

The S.C.M. Press has published a small volume of poetry by an Indian former student of Westcott Hall, Cambridge, Mr. M. A. Thomas—*Meditations of an Indian Christian* (5s. net). Mr. Thomas has travelled extensively in the United States and is now settled in South India. His verses are of unequal merit, but there are some beautiful lines, and his thought shows the characteristic Indian desire for solitude in religious contemplation and a preference for the restfulness of the country to the turbulence of the town. The feeling is dominant that separation is not right, and that through the love of Christ one may learn to say to Time that 'the Eternal speaks to me wherever I am.' The book supports the confidence which Canon Raven has expressed in his Foreword—'How great will be the spiritual splendour available if and when the peoples of India take their full place in the Christian community.'

Human Nature and Christian Marriage, by the Rev. William P. Wylie (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), can be cordially recommended as a book for intelligent people, whether married or not, who want a clear statement of a positive Christian doctrine of sex, love and marriage, which can hold its own with contemporary false doctrine and ignorant or selfish practice. Young people especially should read it; but older people, too, will find in it spiritual insights and practical advice for which they may thank God.

The Present Position in the Controversy Concerning the Problem of the Historical Jesus[1]

By the Reverend Professor Joachim Jeremias, D.D., Göttingen

To any one who is not aware of the controversy the question whether the historical Jesus and His message have any significance for the Christian faith must sound absurd. No one in the ancient Church, no one in the Church of the Reformation and the two succeeding centuries, thought of asking such a question. How is it possible that to-day this question is being asked in all seriousness; that, at least in Germany, it even occupies a central place in New Testament controversy; and that in many quarters it is being answered with a decisive negative? A widely held theological position maintains that the historical Jesus and His message have no, or at least no decisive, significance for the Christian faith. We ask: (1) Why is such a point of view possible? How has it arisen? What is its basis? and (2) What has criticism to say about it?

I

In order to understand the position of Rudolf Bultmann and his school it is necessary to retrace the way by which this position has been reached. We shall here attempt to sketch out its broad outlines.

1. The problem of the historical Jesus is of recent origin; the date of its birth can be precisely fixed at 1778. That date tells us that the problem of the historical Jesus is a child of the Enlightenment. The earlier ages held fast to the position that the Gospels give us absolutely reliable information about Jesus; they saw no problem here. New Testament study of the Gospels before the Enlightenment essentially confined itself to the task of paraphrasing and harmonizing the Four Gospels. In practice New Testament exegesis was a handmaid to the study of Dogmatics. It was at the end of the eighteenth century that the fact was first recognized that the historical Jesus and the Christ proclaimed by the Church and in the Gospels are not the same. The man who announced the stark fact was Hermann Samuel Reimarus. Born in Hamburg in 1694, he was a Professor of Oriental Languages, and hence not a theologian; he died in 1768. At his death he left a manuscript which came into the hands of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, who, between 1774 and 1778, published seven excerpts from it. The seventh piece bore the title *Concerning the Aim of Jesus and His Disciples. Another Fragment by the Anonymous Author from Wolfenbüttel* [1778; pp. 276]. We must, says Reimarus, distinguish between the 'aim' of Jesus, that is, the purpose which He set before Himself, and the 'aim' of His disciples. Jesus' purpose must be understood in the light of the Cry from the Cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?', words which proclaimed the failure of His purpose. That is to say: Jesus was a Jewish political Messiah, who sought to set up an earthly kingdom and to deliver the Jews from a foreign yoke. The Cry from the Cross shows that His 'aim' had not been attained. The 'aim' of His disciples was totally different. Confronted by the collapse of their dream, what were they to do? They had no wish to return to their trade: how, then, were they to live? They contrived to steal the corpse of Jesus, and by inventing the message of His resurrection and return gathered adherents. Hence it was the disciples who created the figure of Christ.

There was great consternation, and the hate-filled pamphlet rightly met with general rejection. Hate is no guide to historical truth. Nevertheless, Reimarus, the outsider, had been the first to recognize with clear perception a fact which had hitherto been overlooked. He had seen that the Jesus of history and the Christ preached by the Church are not the same. History and dogma are two different things. The problem of the historical Jesus starts with Reimarus. Rightly did Albert Schweitzer

[1] *Literature:* M. Kähler, *Der sogennante historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus* [1892; new impression 1953]; A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, Eng. tr.[2] [1936]; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Eng tr. i. [1952], ii. [1955]; E. Käsemann, 'Das Problem des historischen Jesus,' in *Zeitschr. f. Theol. und Kirche*, li. [1954] 125–153; N. A. Dahl, 'Der historische Jesus als geisteswissenschaftliches und theologisches Problem,' in *Kerygma und Dogma*, i. [1955] 104–152; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, Eng. tr. [1954]; T. W. Manson, 'The Life of Jesus: Some Tendencies in Present-day Research,' in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (C. H. Dodd *Festschrift*) [1956], 211–221; E. Heitsch, 'Die Aporie des historischen Jesus als Problem theologischer Hermeneutik,' in *Zeitschr. f. Theol. und Kirche*, liii. [1956] 192–210; E. Fuchs, 'Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus,' *ib.*, liii. [1956] 210–229.

entitle the first edition of his history of the study of the life of Jesus, *From Reimarus to Wrede* [1906].

2. The representation of the historical Jesus put forward by Reimarus was clearly absurd and amateurish. Jesus was no political revolutionary. Our sources bear unambiguous and trustworthy testimony that He was sharply opposed to the nationalistic Zealot leanings of His environment. Who was He in reality ?

The study of the life of Jesus in which the Enlightenment now engaged was inspired by a liberal theology, and, indeed, represented a revolt against ecclesiastical dogma. This whole scholarly activity, centred on the historical Jesus, represented an attempt to break loose from dogma. The battle-cry was, Back to Jesus, the Man of Nazareth ! Not Christological dogma, but the personality and religion of Jesus are the decisive factors.

Under the shelter of this watchword a multitude of pictures of Jesus came into being, and we smile as we read them to-day. These representations vary greatly. The rationalists pictured Jesus as a teacher of morality, the idealists as the ideal Man, the æsthetes extolled Him as the artist in speech, the socialists as the friend of the poor and social reformer, and the innumerable pseudo-scientists made Him a figure of romance. Jesus was modernized. These lives of Jesus are mere products of wish-fulfilment. The outcome of it all is that every epoch, every theology, every author finds in the personality of Jesus the reflection of his own ideal. What has gone wrong ? It is that, unconsciously, dogma has been replaced by psychology and fantasy. For all these lives of Jesus have one thing in common, their delineation of the personality of Jesus has been achieved by means of these two factors, psychology and fantasy. The main share of the responsibility rests, not with the sources alone, but with the uncontrolled psychological creative activity. It was truly disastrous that Albert Schweitzer, who throughout his whole work had exposed with relentless insight the true nature of this wish-fulfilment, should himself have been ensnared by the fallacy of psychological reconstruction when he interpreted Mt 10^{23} to mean that Jesus' disappointment concerning His expectation brought about the great crisis in His life, leading Him to embark upon the way of the Cross as the means to force the coming of the Kingdom.

The so-called positive theology wisely confined itself at first to warding off these attempts, and hence to an apologetic attitude. It was in 1892 that theology first passed over to the attack with a book by Martin Kähler, in advance of its time, embodying a definite thesis, and entitled *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus* (*The So-called Jesus of History, and the Historical, Biblical Christ*). The title of this work must be carefully studied if we wish to understand Kähler's thesis. Kähler distinguishes, on the one hand, between ' Jesus ' and ' Christ,' and, on the other hand, between ' *historisch* ' and ' *geschichtlich*.' By ' Jesus ' he understood and described the Man of Nazareth as the lives of Jesus had described Him ; by ' Christ ' he understood the Saviour proclaimed by the Church. The term ' *historisch* ' meant for him the bare facts of the past, while ' *geschichtlich* ' meant that which possesses permanent significance. And now he placed in opposition to one another the so-called ' historical Jesus,' as the lives of Jesus had sought to reconstruct Him, and the ' *geschichtlich*,' Biblical Christ, as the apostles had proclaimed Him. His thesis runs : simply the Biblical Christ is capable of our apprehension, and alone is of permanent significance for faith. Only as the Gospels portray Him, and not as the self-styled scientific reconstructions present Him, does ' the unavoidable impression of the fullest reality ' make its impact upon us.[1] At first, however, Kähler's challenge went unheard ; only in our time, when Rudolf Bultmann took it up, has it received full attention.

3. During the last decade, under the weighty influence of Rudolf Bultmann, it has attained truly disturbing prominence. Critical theology, after being occupied for a hundred and fifty years with the historical Jesus, has clearly recognized that she has undertaken an impossible task ; she has had the courage to acknowledge it openly, and has gone over with banners flying into the enemy camp. She has denied all her past history ; she has vindicated Kähler, she has declared her preoccupation with the historical Jesus to have been an insoluble and fruitless undertaking ; and has withdrawn again into the inviolable fortress of the Kerygma.

She has based her renunciation of the historical Jesus and her return to the apostolic preaching of Christ upon two considerations.

(*a*) She points to the absence of sources. We have no writings from the hand of Jesus, such as we possess from the hand of the apostle Paul. On the contrary, we know Jesus only from the Gospels, which are not biographies, but confessions of faith. They contain a great deal of secondary material which has been much subjected to editorial activity, and many legends (one need only refer to the miracle stories). All Four Gospels picture Jesus as He is apprehended by the faith of the Evangelists : Mark depicts the hidden Son of Man ; Matthew the secret King of Israel ; Luke the Lord of the future Church ; John the self-revealing Son of Man. From this material, as a hundred unavailing attempts have shown, it is not possible to

[1] New edition [1953] 57.

construct a life of Jesus. From this fact we must draw the full consequences, namely, that we can only know Jesus clad in the garb of myth. We must acknowledge that we cannot go behind the Kerygma; if, nevertheless, we attempt to do so, we find ourselves on shaking ground.

(*b*) Now it is not as if the sources left us entirely in the lurch. The time is past when scientific scepticism could doubt whether Jesus had ever lived at all. On the contrary, we are able to gain some information about Jesus Himself and also about His teaching. But when we apply historical criticism to the analysis of the sources, the results yield us nothing of any significance for faith. For this Jesus of Nazareth was a Jewish prophet. He was certainly a prophet, who, since He demanded absolute obedience, saw mankind as totally sinful, and proclaimed Divine forgiveness to them, and 'had embraced the Jewish conception of God in its purity and its consequences.'[1] He was indeed a prophet, who claimed that a man's attitude towards His word determined his attitude toward God. But, for all that, He remained within the limits of Judaism. He preached a thoroughgoing Old Testament Jewish belief in God.[2] For Bultmann, the history of Jesus is part of the history of Judaism, not of Christianity. This Jewish prophet has historical interest for New Testament theology, but He has, and can have, no significance for Christian faith, since (and here we have an astonishing thesis) Christianity began with the Resurrection. Here a decisive point has been reached. Who ever would conceive the idea that Islam began after Muhammad's death, or Buddhism after the death of Buddha? If we accept the thesis that Christianity began at Easter with the proclamation of the Risen Christ, then indeed the logical inference is that since Jesus was only a Jewish prophet He does not belong to Christianity. The opening sentence of Bultmann's *New Testament Theology* runs, 'The message of Jesus belongs to the presuppositions of the theology of the New Testament rather than to that theology itself,'[3] where the plural, 'presuppositions,' must be specially noted. It implies that the message of Jesus is one of the presuppositions of New Testament theology among many others, and perhaps not even the most important one. Other factors are just as important: the Easter experience of the disciples, the Jewish Messianic expectation, the mythology of the pagan world which provided the garment with which Jesus of Nazareth was to be clothed. The study of Jesus and His message may be very interesting and instructive for the historical understanding of the rise of Christianity, but it has no significance for faith.

This, then, is the double basis upon which modern critical theology rests its rejection of the historical Jesus. (1) We cannot write a life of Jesus because the sources are lacking, and (2) what we can regard as historical is a Jewish prophet and His message, neither of which have any significance for faith. Hence it follows that our task to-day is not to pursue the phantom of the historical Jesus, but to interpret the Kerygma, namely, the message of the apostle Paul about the justification of sinners. Certainly the Christianity of the Pauline and Johannine communities bore the impress of the eclecticism of the Hellenistic period, and as such belongs to the syncretism of that time.[4] But this is not an insuperable difficulty. We must demythologize the message and translate it into modern terms, perhaps with the help of existential philosophy.

Gerhard Ebeling has strongly emphasized these ideas when he says: the revelation is '*kein historisches Faktum*' ('not an historical datum'),[5] nor is it '*ein geschichtliches Geschehen*' ('an event in history')[6]; it was not accomplished and completed during the years 1–30, but it continues to take place whenever the Kerygma is preached. Revelation takes place in the act of faith.[7]

When we consider this theological position, we are struck first of all by its positive content. To-day critical research is very different from what it was in the previous century. It is bent on taking the entire Kerygma into account, and evaluating it. The positive significance of this is immense. Nevertheless I see very grave dangers in this theological position. They are these: we are in danger of surrendering the affirmation, 'the Word became flesh' and of abandoning the salvation-history, God's activity in the Man Jesus of Nazareth and in His message; we are in danger of approaching Docetism, where Christ becomes an idea.

II

What has criticism to say with regard to the position which we have described?

1. (*a*) Without doubt it is true to say that the dream is over of the possibility of writing a life of Jesus. Nevertheless we must go back to the historical Jesus and His message. We cannot pass Him by. Quite apart from all theological considerations, there are two circumstances which

[1] R. Bultmann, *Jesus* [1926], 143.

[2] R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Eng. tr., i. [1952], ii. [1955].

[3] *Op. cit.*, 1.

[4] E. Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* [1949].

[5] *Die Geschichtlichkeit der Kirche und ihrer Verkündigung als theologisches Problem* [1954], 59.

[6] *Op. cit.*, 59.

[7] *Op. cit.*, 63.

compel us to make the attempt to ascertain the character of the gospel as Jesus proclaimed it. First of all it is the sources which force us ever and again to raise the question of the historical Jesus and His message. Every verse of the Gospels tells us that the origin of Christianity is not the Kerygma, not the Resurrection experience of the disciples, not the Christ-idea, but an historical event, to wit, the appearance of the Man Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and His message. I must specially emphasize the last words—and His message. The gospel that Jesus proclaimed precedes the Kerygma of the primitive community. Certainly the accounts of Jesus and His message were made use of by the Early Church in its confession of faith, and the Gospels are certainly not biographies in the sense of the Greek biographies (that much we have learnt); nevertheless there has been gross exaggeration here. It is not as though it were all the product of imagination. Paul wrote earlier than all Four Gospels, and he was the great theologian in the Gentile Christian Church before the composition of the Gospels. But Pauline terminology is scarcely to be found in the Gospels. Over and over again we meet with words which unmistakably imply a pre-Resurrection situation. Only occasionally do we meet with traces here and there of Christological colouring; and even if the colouring had overlaid everything, the study of the historical Jesus would still remain an imperative task, since the absence of primary sources should be no occasion for the abandonment of historical research.

(*b*) But it is not only the sources which compel us to raise ever and again the problem of the Jesus of history and His message; the Kerygma too, the preaching of Christ by the Early Church refers us back from itself at every turn. For the Kerygma proclaims an historical event: God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. God revealed Himself in an event in history. But in particular the very heart of the Kerygma lies in the words, 'died for our sins according to the scriptures.' An historical event is implied here: this death happened for us. But this raises the question whether this meaning of the crucifixion of Jesus has been arbitrarily impressed upon the event, or whether there was some circumstance in the event which caused this meaning to be attached to it. In other words, we must ask: did Jesus Himself speak about His impending death, and what significance did He attach to it? This question takes precedence of all others; it is vital for the faith. The same consideration holds good for the preaching of the Resurrection; it always refers back from itself. The Risen and Exalted Christ, whom the apostles preach and to whom the community prays, has features, facial characteristics, traits of character, with which the disciples were familiar, the features and traits of an earthly master. The same is true of Paul and all the rest of the preaching of the Early Church. Paul was opposed to the self-righteousness of Jewish legalism, to the self-complacency of the pious and to their self-glorification, against which he set the message that we are saved by faith alone, that God offers salvation, not to the righteous, but to the sinner who trusts alone in His forgiveness. But that, although couched in other terms, is the very message of Jesus. It is clear that we cannot understand the message of Paul unless we know the message of Jesus. Whatever utterance of the Kerygma presents itself to us, its origins are always to be found in the message of Jesus.

This, then, is the first consideration: we must continually return to the historical Jesus and His message. The sources demand it; the Kerygma, which refers us back from itself, likewise requires it. Expressed in theological terms the Incarnation implies that the story of Jesus is not only a possible subject for historical research, study, and criticism, but that it demands all of these. We need to know who the Jesus of history was, and what was the content of His message. We may not avoid the offence of the Incarnation. And if it be objected that we fail to apprehend the essential nature of the act of faith if we make historical knowledge the object of faith, and that faith is in this way sacrificed to such a dubious, subjective, and hypothetical study, we can only reply that God has sacrificed Himself. The Incarnation is the self-sacrifice of God, and to that we can only bow in assent.

Moreover, it is actually at this very point that the latest theological development pushes on beyond Bultmann. It has become obvious that the problem of the historical Jesus must be taken seriously, and thus the situation in modern New Testament studies is not so complicated as it might seem at first sight.

2. We must follow along the way of the historical Jesus and His message, exactly where it leads us. But, and this is the second consideration, we can venture on it with confidence, nor need we fear that we are embarking on a perilous, fruitless adventure. But the question arises whether we may not be in danger of finding ourselves once again landed in a subjective, modernizing life of Jesus? Is there not a risk that we, too, like the whole of the nineteenth century, unconsciously and unintentionally, may project our own theology into Jesus of Nazareth? With regard to this it must be said that it is certainly never wholly possible for the historian to divest himself of his own personality. We shall never be entirely able

to obviate this source of danger. Nevertheless we need not give up in despair, for our position is entirely different from that in the previous century. We are actually better equipped. We possess to-day, if I may use a metaphor, ramparts which will preserve us from an arbitrary modernization of Jesus, that is, which will protect us from ourselves.

Here I may content myself with suggestions, and briefly indicate a fivefold aspect of the case.

(*a*) The critical labours of the previous century have thrown up the first rampart for us in the shape of a literary criticism which they have created by means of a remarkable and increasingly skilful technique. We have been taught to distinguish sources, or more correctly (since we are becoming more and more sceptical about the assumption of written sources), strands of tradition: a Markan tradition, a Logia tradition, the special Lukan, Matthæan, and Johannine traditions. Having established this, literary criticism leads us back to the stage of oral tradition preceding our Gospels. We have, moreover, been taught to recognize the literary style of the Evangelists, and hence to distinguish between tradition and redaction; we have been thus enabled to trace back the tradition into its pre-literary stage.

(*b*) Form-criticism has led us a step further back by attempting to work out the laws which governed the shaping of the material; it has thus thrown light from another side upon the creation and growth of the tradition. It is not sufficiently known and observed that the essential significance of Form-Criticism lies in the fact that it has enabled us to remove a Hellenistic layer which had overlaid an earlier Palestinian tradition.

(c) We have been carried an important step further on the way back to Jesus by contemporary studies which have revealed to us the environment of Jesus, and have informed us about the religious points of view and Palestinian customs in the time of Jesus, involving the study of rabbinical literature and late Jewish apocalyptic. As one who has lived for years in Palestine, I can testify from my own experience how much new light has been thrown in this way upon the Gospels. The primary importance of the study of ancient and also of modern Palestine does not lie in the fact that it has revealed to us how Jesus belonged to His own time; its main significance lies rather in the way in which it has helped us to realize afresh the sharpness of Jesus' opposition to the religiosity of His time. Here, too, lies the main importance of the recently discovered Dead Sea texts. The Essenism which they reveal to us enables us to realize from their own testimony to what an extent the whole of late Judaism was imbued with a passion to establish a pure Divine community. We can now estimate more clearly than heretofore the significance of the emphatic denial with which Jesus met all these attempts.

(*d*) A further result of the study of the environment of Jesus has been to force upon us the necessity of studying His mother-tongue. It is barely sixty years ago since Dalman, in my estimation, proved conclusively that Jesus spoke Galilæan Aramaic. Since then the study of this dialect has been pursued, but is still only in an early stage. We still lack a critical edition of the texts, and a vocabulary of Galilæan Aramaic. But already the researches so far carried out have shown how rewarding this laborious, detailed, philological study can be. It is only necessary to recall in how many cases the same word of Jesus has been transmitted to us in different Greek forms. In most of the cases it is a question of differences in translation, which constitute a reliable aid toward the reconstruction of the Aramaic form of the saying underlying the various versions. Indeed the Paternoster, of which the Greek rendering in Matthew and Luke shows many divergences, can by this means be retranslated into the speech of Jesus with a high degree of probability. Any one who has ever had anything to do with translations is aware that they can never take the place of the original, and will be able to estimate how important it is that it should be possible for us to get back with greater certainty to the original Aramaic underlying the Greek tradition. In this connexion it is of special importance to establish the fact that by this study peculiarities in the utterances of Jesus have been revealed which are without contemporary parallels. As a form of address to God the word 'Abba' is without parallel in the whole of late Jewish devotional literature. Similarly there is no contemporary analogy to the use by Jesus of 'Amen' as an introduction to His own utterances. It may be maintained that these two examples of Jesus' own utterances contain in a nutshell the message of Jesus and His consciousness of His authority.

(*e*) Of special significance as a defence against a psychological modernizing of Jesus is the rediscovery of the eschatological character of His message. It is not only that we have learnt to recognize how intensely Jesus lived in the conceptions of contemporary apocalyptic and made use of its language; the decisive importance of this discovery lies elsewhere: we have seen how the whole message of Jesus flowed from His awareness that God was about to break into history, His awareness of the approaching crisis, the coming judgment, and the implication that it was against this background that He proclaimed the presence in His own ministry of the Kingdom of God.

It is clear, then, that Jesus was no Jewish Rabbi, no teacher of wisdom, or prophet, but that His

message was about a God who was at the present moment offering a share in salvation to the despised, the oppressed, and the despairing; a message which ran counter to all the religiosity of His time, and was in truth the end of Judaism.

Albert Schweitzer, at the end of his book *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, has summed up in graphic imagery the outcome of the attempts to write a life of Jesus: 'The study of the Life of Jesus has had a curious history. It set out in quest of the historical Jesus, believing that when it had found Him it could bring Him straight into our time as a Teacher and Saviour. It loosed the bands by which He had been riveted for centuries to the stony rocks of ecclesiastical doctrine, and rejoiced to see life and movement coming into the figure once more, and the historical Jesus advancing, as it seemed, to meet it. But He does not stay; He passes by our time and returns to His own.'[1] Such was in fact the remarkable outcome of the study of the Life of Jesus begun in 1778. It had freed Jesus from fetters; He became a living figure, belonging to the present; He became a man of our own time. Yet He did not stay, but passed on beyond our time and returned to His own. It became clear that He was not a man of our time, but the prophet of Nazareth, who spoke the language of the prophets of the old Covenant and proclaimed the God of the old Covenant. But we must now extend Schweitzer's metaphor. Jesus did not remain in His own time, but He passed beyond His own time. He did not remain the rabbi of Nazareth, the prophet of late Judaism. He receded into the distance, entered into the dim light of the Resurrection morning, and became, as Schweitzer says in the closing sentence of his book, the unknown and nameless One who utters the word, 'Follow thou me!'[2]

3. If we tread the way thus described, between the five protecting walls which guard us from modernizing Jesus and seeing Him according to our own pattern, the result is that we are confronted by a unique claim to authority which breaks through the bounds of the Old Testament and Judaism. Everywhere we are confronted in the message of Jesus by this final claim, that is to say, we are confronted by the same claim to faith as that with which the Kerygma presents us. It must here be stated in the simplest and most obvious way of all, since it is no longer self-evident. To wit—every sentence of the sources bears witness of it to us, every verse of our Gospels hammers it into us: something has happened, something unique, something which has never before come into existence. We have a mass of parallels and analogies in the comparative history of religions. The monumental work of Billerbeck is unsurpassed and will long remain so. Yet the more we multiply analogies, the clearer it becomes that there are no analogies to the message of Jesus. There is no parallel to the message of Jesus that God is concerned with sinners and not with the righteous, and that He has already given them a share in His Kingdom. There is no parallel to Jesus' sitting down to meat with publicans and sinners. There is no parallel to the authority with which He dares to address God as 'Abba.' Any one who merely admits the fact, and I cannot see how it can be gainsaid, that the word 'Abba' is the very utterance of Jesus, and who understands the word correctly, with due attention to its meaning, is thereby confronted with Jesus' claim to authority. Any one who reads the Parable of the Prodigal Son, which belongs to the original stuff of the tradition, and observes how Jesus in this Parable, in which He describes the unimaginable goodness of the Divine forgiveness, justifies His table-fellowship with publicans and sinners, is again confronted with the claim of Jesus to be regarded as the accredited representative of God. The multiplication of examples yields ever the same result: if, with the utmost zeal and conscientiousness, using the critical resources at our disposal, we occupy ourselves with the historical Jesus, the result is always the same, we find ourselves in the presence of God Himself. That is the unique fact to which the sources bear witness. A Man has appeared; those who heard His message were indeed aware that they had heard the word of God. It is not as if faith were taken away from us, or belittled, when exegesis shows us that behind every word of Jesus and every deed lies His claim to authority (how should that deprive us of faith?). Indeed, the truth of the matter is that through the words and acts of Jesus at every turn the challenge to faith is presented. If we treat the Gospels as history, we must see in them the claim of Jesus to authority. This claim to Divine authority is the origin of Christianity, and hence occupation with the historical Jesus and His message is no marginal task of New Testament scholarship, no mere occupation with a particular historical problem among many others, but it is the central task of New Testament scholarship.

[1] A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, Eng. tr. [1936], 397.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 401.

III

This brings us to one final question. If it be true that the good news of Jesus in word and deed is the beginning of Christianity, then the question arises: What is the relation between the good news of Jesus and the Early Church's proclamation of faith, between the pre-Resurrection and the

post-Resurrection message, between the gospel and Kerygma? With regard to this there are two things to be said.

1. The good news of Jesus and the Early Church's proclamation of faith are inseparable from one another. Neither of these two major issues may be isolated. For the gospel of Jesus remains dead history without the proclamation of faith by the Church, which ever afresh expands, avows, and attests this gospel. Nor can the Kerygma either be isolated. Apart from Jesus and His gospel it is merely the proclamation of an idea or a theory. He who isolates the message of Jesus ends up in Ebionitism. He who isolates the Kerygma of the Early Church ends up in Docetism.

2. If then these two belong together, the gospel of Jesus and the Early Church's proclamation of faith, and neither of these two important issues may be isolated, it is also of the utmost importance to recognize that they are not both on the same level. The gospel of Jesus and the Kerygma of the Early Church must not be placed on the same footing, but they are related together as call and response. The life, acts, and death of Jesus, the authoritative word of Him who dared to say Abba, the one who with Divine authority invited sinners to His Table, and as the Servant of God went to the Cross, is the call of God. The Early Church's proclamation of faith, the Spirit-led chorus of a thousand tongues, is the answer to God's call. The Byzantine Church delighted to express this relationship in representations of the universal worship, in the midst of which is depicted a gigantic figure of the Crucified, towards whom, to right and left, there streams a countless host on earth and in heaven. What such representations say is that Jesus of Nazareth is God's call, confession of Him is the response. This response has a double aspect: it is praise and adoration to God, and witness to the world. It is inspired by the Spirit of God, but it does not take the place of the call. The call, not the response is the decisive thing. The many-sided confession of faith of the Early Church, of Paul, of John, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, must be judged in the light of the message of Jesus.

Our protest against the equating of the gospel and the Kerygma is concerned with the concept of Revelation. According to the testimony of the New Testament there is no other revelation of God but the incarnate Word. The preaching of the Early Church concerning this is the divinely inspired witness to the revelation, but the Church's preaching is not itself revelation. Revelation does not take place on Sundays from ten to eleven. The doctrine of continuous revelation is a Gnostic heresy. Thus, at any rate, did Paul conceive of the task of the Kerygma when he told the Galatians that the content of his preaching had been the depiction of Christ crucified before their eyes.

Once more: according to the testimony of the New Testament the Church's preaching is not revelation, but it leads to revelation. Jesus is the Lord. The Lord is above the messenger. For faith there is no other authority but the Lord. The historical Jesus and His message are not one presupposition among many for the Kerygma, but the sole presupposition of the Kerygma. Thus, indeed, the response presupposes the call, and the witness to the revelation presupposes the revelation. Only the Son of Man and His word can give authority to the message. No one else and nothing else.

Recent Foreign Theology

The Didache. In the famous series of *Études Bibliques* a very important edition of the Didache has appeared, from the pen of J. P. Audet.[1] This was not written specially for the series, but accepted for the series after the author had been led by his researches to prepare it. Since its discovery last century the Didache has occasioned much discussion and very diverse conclusions. These are carefully surveyed in the present work and the extensive Introduction presents the author's detailed examination of the problems and the solutions he proposes. He holds that the original title was short, and was in the plural, *The Instructions of the Apostles*. By the careful analysis of the text he finds that there was a *thou* part and a *you* part, both coming from the original author, but at different times, and that the work later received some interpolations. Both the author and the interpolator were apostles and the whole work was completed before A.D. 70, and was therefore composed in the same age as the earliest Gospels. Indeed Father Audet finds reflections of the work in the Gospels themselves. The relations with the Epistle of Barnabas and other early works are studied with great care, and any direct borrowing on either side is denied. On the problem of the source of the section of the book dealing with the Two Ways, Father Audet makes use of material from the Dead Sea Scrolls, and concludes that an original Jewish work provided the sources of the various treatments of this theme. As to the place where the Didache was written, the author thinks

[1] *La Didaché: Instructions des Apôtres* [1958]. Gabalda, Paris; Fr. 4,200.

it was certainly Palestine or Syria, and probably Antioch. The text and translation of the work with a very full commentary follow the Introduction, and the whole forms a most important contribution to the study of the Didache. The author does not claim that it is definitive, but it may be said with confidence that it is not likely to be quickly superseded, and no future student of the problems can wisely neglect this work.

The Date of the Last Supper. An important book presenting some new and original views on the Last Supper has been published in the same series of *Études Bibliques*. This is by Mlle A. Jaubert,[1] whose views had been adumbrated in articles already published. She begins by a careful study of the calendar of the Book of Jubilees, which was so arranged that each month began on the same day of the week every year. This meant that the festivals fell on the same day of the week every year, and the most important days were Wednesday, Friday and Sunday. This calendar was not a new one, though it was not the current calendar at the time when the Book of Jubilees was written. For Mlle Jaubert finds traces of it in the Priestly Code. According to this calendar the Passover should have been eaten on Tuesday night. Mlle Jaubert advances the view that our Lord followed this calendar, which was also the calendar used by the sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and therefore holds that the Last Supper was a Passover meal, eaten on Tuesday night. She adduces a good deal of patristic evidence for this view, and also finds that it is consistent with the evidence of the Synoptic Gospels. This has the advantage that it does not crowd the night following the Supper, and allows the events between the arrest and the Crucifixion on Friday to be fitted in more reasonably and in accordance with Jewish law. The two meetings of the Sanhedrin then fall on succeeding days, and not within a few hours. The harmonization of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel is then effected by the view that the Fourth Gospel's references to unwillingness to enter the praetorium for fear of defilement and consequent inability to eat the Passover means the official Passover which fell on Friday, as opposed to the sectarian date. The apparent disagreement between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel has long provided a difficulty, which has led some scholars to reject the Fourth Gospel's view that Passover fell on Friday in favour of a Thursday Passover, and others to accept the view of the Fourth Gospel and consequently to reject the idea that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. Mlle Jaubert has reopened the question in a completely new way, and has presented her view with great skill and with much evidence.

[1] *La date de la Cène : Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne* [1957]. Gabalda, Paris ; Fr. 780.

The Louvre and the Bible. Mention has frequently been made in these columns of the series of excellent little books published under the title of *Cahiers d'Archéologie Biblique* by André Parrot. The latest of these is entitled *The Louvre Museum and the Bible*.[2] It runs through the Bible from the beginning to the end, indicating both by description and by innumerable figures in the text and plates the materials to be found in the Louvre for its illustration. Here may be found the Code of Hammurabi and the Moabite Stone, finds from Mari and Ras Shamra, and a jar from the Qumran caves, together with innumerable other interesting things from the whole of the ancient Near East. Readers who are not able to visit the Louvre will profit from the illustrations, and the arrangement of the material in the order of the Biblical narratives illustrated will be found helpful. Professor Parrot is a skilled and successful excavator as well as Curator of the French National Museums, and no better guide through the Louvre could be found.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

[2] *La Musée du Louvre et la Bible* [1957]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris ; Swiss Fr. 7·50.

The Teacher of Righteousness

By the Reverend Kevin Smyth, S.J., Dublin

If Jesus of Nazareth never claimed to be the Messiah of Israel ; if He thought of Himself at most as a prophet ; if He left His disciples chiefly a lively hope of His return as Messiah : then—if the Qumran Teacher was looked on as a prophet ; if his followers keenly expected the End ; if they awaited his return as the priestly Messiah—Qumran might be regarded as the generator of currents, which, through the transformer of Christianity, became the light of the world.

A New Testament reduced to such an 'authentic' nucleus ; a Qumran religion concentrated on such a Teacher : these are the true bases of comparison, as proposed by K. Stendahl in the

opening essay of *The Scrolls and the New Testament*.[1] He is contradicted in the next essay by O. Cullmann, who holds that the only contacts are in doctrine and institutions. And the other writers do not share Stendahl's perspective, which approximates to that of E. Wilson, A. Dupont-Sommer, J. M. Allegro. We shall discuss only one term of the comparison, 'The Teacher of Righteousness.' But first, two protests. One against the editor's indiscriminate use of 'messianic,' 'eschatological,' 'world to come.' They are not necessarily synonyms. The second against such 'English' as this: 'As long as the unsophisticated self-consciousness as the chosen ones was applied to the whole people, God's righteousness was synonymous with his salvation, with his giving of victory and triumph to his own' (p. 9). Such scrambled messages are far too frequent in the book.

It is often assumed, and perhaps too readily, that it was the Teacher who brought about in his community a tense expectation of the End. They had formed a definite group long before His advent, and probably looked on themselves from the beginning as an 'eschatological community' (Zadokite Work [CDC][2] 1^{7-11}). The Teacher's contribution (Habacuc Commentary [1 QpHab][3] $2^{7f.}$) was to make known 'what God would do to the last generation'—of apostates (CDC 1^{11}), rather than to announce that the last days had come. Possibly his most personal contribution was to affirm that 'the last days would be prolonged, far and away beyond anything that the prophets had foretold' (1 QpHab $7^{7f.}$). At least, that is put forward as a clarification of the words of Habacuc, and the Teacher's rôle was to explain the prophets (1 QpHab $2^{8f.}$; $7^{4f.}$). His words may even have moderated the excitement of the sect, as it mounted under the pressure of Old Testament prophecy and of the horrors let loose by Antiochus Epiphanes, 168 B.C. The conviction that 'God must, and therefore will do something soon about everything' needed no special impulse. The religion of all Israel centred on the covenant, by which God was 'bound' to put an end to sin and inaugurate an era of His grace and kingship.

Another point could have much more relevance to 'Qumran and Christianity' than the sharing of eschatological earnestness. Was the death of the Teacher proclaimed as salvific by himself or regarded as such by his disciples? If we think that the Teacher had for his disciples all the significance of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh; or if we think that the community regarded its tribulations, and *a fortiori*, those of the Teacher, as expiatory (so J. M. Allegro), we might see at Qumran a headline for Christianity. In spite of J. Jeremias ('The Servant of Yahweh' [Kittel, *TWzNT*, v. 635–713]) it cannot be proved that Judaism applied Is 53 to the Messiah. Hence if the notion of vicarious satisfaction, especially that of an individual, was in vogue at Qumran, and above all, if it was attached to one expected as the Messiah, a central doctrine of Christianity might be only a variation, not a theme in its own right. We should of course still have to account for the nuclear fusion, and the cosmic release of energy that followed it, when the New Testament combined into one the Suffering Servant, the Messiah, the Son of Man and the Son of God. Such fusion demands after all an incredible rise in temperature—how produced? But at least we might have accounted for one of the atoms.

G. H. Kuhn (*The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 178) states flatly that 'in the Qumran texts we find no trace of such an ultimately redemptive significance of an historical person.' We may cite Kuhn safely because he is inclined to exaggerate 'the similarities and even dependence of Christianity' on Qumran. There are in fact no texts on which to found even inferences. We are left then with one point of possibly 'pivotal' (Stendahl) significance. Did the Teacher colour the Messianic hopes of Qumran by focusing their gaze on his return or resurrection from the other world?

That the Teacher did not loom so large as Stendahl suggests might be deduced at once from the fact that the other writers in his book do not seem to be peering about in the shadow of this colossus. But to state what we do know about the Teacher, we turn to one of the most recent of Dr. H. H. Rowley's expert and judicious summaries.[4] It goes as follows. According to CDC the sect groped like blind men for twenty years, till God raised up for them a Teacher of Righteous-

[1] *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, Ed. by K. Stendahl (S.C.M.; 35s. net). Contents (titles abridged): 'An Introduction and a Perspective' (K. Stendahl); 'Beginnings of Christianity' (O. Cullmann); 'John the Baptist' (W. H. Brownlee); 'The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel'; 'The Lord's Supper'; 'Temptation, Sin and Flesh' (K. G. Kuhn); 'Peace among Men of God's Good Pleasure' [Lk 2^{14}] (E. Vogt, S.J.); 'The Sermon on the Mount' (K. Schubert); 'The Jerusalem Church of Acts' (S. E. Johnson); 'Constitution of the Primitive Church' (B. Reicke); 'Johannine Gospel and Epistles' (R. Brown, S.S.); 'The Ebionites' (J. Fitzmeyer, S.J.); 'Hillel the Elder' (N. Glatzer)'

[2] Cairo Damascus Covenant.

[3] Habacuc—pešer, Qumran Cave I.

[4] *The Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, by H. H. Rowley, M.A., B.Litt., D.D., Theol.D., F.B.A. (reprinted from the 'Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,' xl. [1957] 114–146). Manchester, University Press; 3s. 6d. net.

ness, with the prophetic gifts of which we have spoken earlier. Of his life and work, CDC tells us only that he gave an authoritative interpretation of the Law. But it speaks of a period between his death and the coming of the Messiahs (we beg leave to assume the plural as proved) of Aaron and of Israel. There is a period (the same ?) between his death and the extermination of the followers of his adversary, the Man of the Lie. 1 QpHab tells us that he was a priest inspired to interpret the prophets. He was abandoned by some of his followers and harried by some of his enemies. His death is not mentioned in connexion with this persecution. There is no ground for including him among the crucified victims of the Lion of Wrath. The fragmentary text which speaks of these latter does not mention the Teacher. While idolators and apostates are doomed, doers of the Law will be saved, in so far as they have followed loyally the interpretation of the Law put forward by the Teacher (1 QpHab 8^{2}—where the translation 'saved because of their faith in the Teacher' should be avoided; see also O. Cullmann in Stendahl, p. 23). Outside CDC and 1 QpHab, there are only a few illusions to the Teacher, none in the other great scrolls from Cave 1. For some time, but not perhaps for long, the sect used the death of the Teacher as one of the co-ordinates in plotting the graph of the age of wickedness. Dr. Rowley points to the cutting-off of an Anointed One (Dn 9^{26}) as having a similar relation to the seventy weeks of years.

The historical background of the Teacher is discussed at some length. If he was none other than Onias, the high priest whose death occasioned the cryptic words of Dn 9^{26}, as Dr. Rowley suggests, we are in the early Seleucid period, about 170 B.C. Others prefer the reign of the Hasmonaean, Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 B.C.), and others again a later date, which would put his death about 50 B.C. The earliest date has much to commend it. For instance, the sect settled at Qumran perhaps as early as 130 B.C. It can hardly have been groping in the dark when it took this decisive step. The Teacher however belongs to its period of trial and error: presumably before 130 B.C.

That the Teacher was expected to return from the dead and exercise in person the functions of the Messiah of Aaron, is not even discussed by Dr. Rowley. This is because the *point névralgique*, as diagnosed by K. Stendahl, is in the probing finger, not in the patient. It is a matter of conjecture, not of historical fact. CDC speaks of keeping certain laws 'till the Teacher of Righteousness comes' (6^{7}). Since CDC speaks of the death of the Teacher, some have maintained that the Teacher promised in CDC 6^{7} is the same person coming again as Messiah. This is barely thinkable. Against it is the fact that the verb (*'amad*) gives no hint of return or resurrection. In the scrolls it is the same as *bo'* (come) and is used very often of the unwelcome arrival of the wicked. To translate it as 'arise' would be tolerable, but could be misleading or even tendentious. Then, the title, Teacher of Righteousness, is a title, not a name, and can be used indifferently of historical or eschatological personages, just as 'the anointed ones' can stand for the ancient prophets (CDC 2^{12}; 6^{1}; 1 QM[1] 11^{7}), as well as for the coming envoys of the last days. Further, the identification of the historical Teacher with a future Messiah is excluded by CDC 19^{35}, which speaks of the period between 'the passing of the Teacher of the community, and the coming of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.' Finally, the general resurrection of the body—whatever about the immortality of the soul—is so ambiguously put, and so remote from the ordinary interests of the scrolls, that some scholars deny its presence entirely. At any rate, on so weak a base we cannot build the pyramid of which the return of the Teacher is to be the apex. C. Rabin, the latest editor of CDC, looks to the expectation of the return of Elias (see Mk $9^{12f.}$) to provide the scaffolding, so to speak, for a Church dedicated to the Resurrection of the Teacher. But Elias is no good counterpart. He was thought of as rapt to heaven alive. The Teacher simply died.

Our actual knowledge of the Teacher is therefore meagre, and unless we use 'maybes' as a spring-board, we cannot soar with him into the empyrean of Christian *parousia* expectations. If we are meticulous, we dare not even call him a prophet, because his precise gift was 'to explain the words of God's servants, the prophets' (1 QpHab $2^{8f.}$). Nor can we use the Thanksgiving Psalms to write part of the story of his heart, because the authorship which has sometimes been ascribed to him is highly debatable.

The essence of Christianity, even in the rudimentary torso left it by Bultmann's demythization, even in the hypothetical form which we assumed to start with (not of course to approve) at Stendahl's behest, is the linking of salvation to the historical Person of Jesus. There was no such dominant personal factor at Qumran. The Law, with or without the Messiahs, remained their real 'saviour.' They did not stand gazing into heaven after their Teacher, like the men of Galilee. They lived in expectancy, it is true; and Christians still lived in expectancy, even after the coming and going of the Lord. But to describe the two religions in these broad terms is simply to say that neither of them was pagan, 'living devoid of hope.'

[1] Milḥamah, War Scroll, Qumran Cave I.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

B. G. R.

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you.'—Jn 13^{15} (R.V.).

There is at least one headmaster who spends a lot of time watching boys pick up pieces of paper round the school. Ask him why, and he will tell you that most boys think 'It's not my job.' As the poet (very nearly) said :

A piece of paper on the verge,
A piece of paper was to George,
And it was nothing more.

The headmaster thinks it is a great deal more. If he finds it there after the whole of Form Three B has walked past, he takes a poor view of the qualities of character that Three B evidence. The paper is a sure sign of things to come. The boy who goes out of his way to pick it up, he reckons, will become a useful member of society. He makes it his job to do what is nobody's job.

Think how many people pass by the broken bottle which could hurt a child in the park : 'it's not their job' to move it. Or the folk who go on grumbling about the nail in the chair at the Youth Club but never think about knocking it in : 'it's not their job.'

If you are selling flags for the orphanage, someone is certain to say, 'I thought the Welfare State looked after all this nowadays' ; and if we try to imagine the plight of the refugee children of Hong-Kong or Korea, we shall probably be told, 'Someone ought to do something about it.' Agreed ; but if we belong to the Lord Christ, we are the people who ought to do it. In Toc H they say, 'Service is the rent we pay for our room upon earth.' Unfortunately, most of us adopt quite a different pass-word, something like 'Bags first,' or 'I'm next on the table tennis.'

There is nobody whose exclusive job it is to move broken glass, or knock in tacks, or care for the helpless, or make life cheery for old and lonely folk. We all ought to be doing it. But it happens so seldom that I have got into the habit of muttering to myself every time I see an act of unselfish service the mysterious letters 'B.G.R.'

What do they mean ? Well, if I tell you a story, it may help you to guess. In the American War of Independence there was an N.C.O. who set his men to fell trees for an urgently needed bridge. The work proceeded slowly. He was short of men. After a time, an officer of high rank came up and spoke to him. 'You haven't enough men ?' he asked. 'No, sir.' 'Why don't you lend a hand yourself ?' 'Me, sir ? Why, I'm a corporal, sir.' 'I see,' said the officer ; and getting off his horse he set to and worked with the men till the bridge was built. As he left, he said, 'Corporal, next time you have a job to put through and too few men, you had better send for the Commander-in-Chief to come again.' He was General Washington. It wasn't his job to hack down trees, but he did it. B.G.R. !

You will have guessed by now what the initials mean—'Broken Glass Remover.' Any one earns that title who goes out of his way to make it easier for others to live. More simply we might call him a disciple of the Lord Jesus. That's it, of course. Jesus made it quite clear that we cannot love God without caring for our fellows at the same time. Selfishness and smugness are two of the greatest sins.

And Jesus did not only *say* that : He showed it in the most memorable way of all. He took the slave's task of washing His disciples' hot and tired feet. Peter thought that it wasn't the Lord's job, but we never read in the story that he offered to do it instead. That was something he had still to learn from his Lord's words : 'I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you.'

A Gift for the King

By the Reverend James Martin, B.D., Glasgow

Many, many years ago—even before Jesus was born—the King of Persia was the mightiest king in the whole world and ruled over very many lands. Every now and again he used to go on a journey through the various parts of his realm to see how things were faring with his people. When he was engaged on one of these tours all his subjects whom he passed by were expected to give the King a handsome present as a sign of their loyalty to him.

On one of these occasions the King passed through a farm set in a lonely country district and came upon the farmer working in his fields. When the farmer saw the King approaching with his company he was greatly dismayed. 'Oh,' he said to himself, 'I ought to give a present to the King, but here I am far from my house and from my stock. What can I give him ?'

As the King drew near the farmer decided what he would give. He stepped across to the stream

which ran through the meadow in which he was working and, gathering up some of its water in his cupped hands, he held it out to his King and said, 'Your Majesty, I would have liked to give you a really fine gift as a token of my love and loyalty. But at the moment I have nothing to offer you except this drink of water. It is, however, the sweetest water in the land, it is the best I have to give, and I give it you with all my heart.'

If you had been that King of Persia, I wonder if you would have felt annoyed at being offered such an ordinary little thing for a present. In actual fact the King was delighted. 'I am so pleased,' he said to the farmer, 'to have your gift. It is your best, and no man can give me any finer gift than that.'

Do you remember how Jesus sat one day and watched the people putting their offerings in the church collection plate? Some put in large amounts of money, but when a poor widow woman came along and put in half a farthing, Jesus said she had put in the finest gift of all because she had given the very best she could.

It is always like that. Whether it has to do with money or any other thing, whatever it has to do with, it is when we give our very best to Jesus that we give Him the gift that pleases Him most. Some of us may not have very much to offer to Jesus, but all of us can offer Him our best, and that will make the finest gift of all.

What can I give Him,
Poor as I am?
If I were a shepherd
I would bring a lamb,
If I were a Wise Man
I would do my part,—
Yet what I can I give Him,
Give my heart.

The Christian Year

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Third Man [1]

BY THE REVEREND W. B. J. MARTIN, AUGUSTINE-BRISTO CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, EDINBURGH

'But what think ye? A certain man had two sons ... Whether of them twain did the will of his father?' —Mt 21[28-31].

It was a favourite dramatic device of Jesus to set two men upon the stage, saying, like Shakespeare,

Look here, upon this picture, and on this;
The counterfeit presentment of two brothers.

[1] This forms part of a series by Mr. Martin on the lesser known Parables. The series will continue for the next four months.

Sometimes they were actual brothers, like the two prodigal sons, or the two young men presented here; sometimes they were contrasting types, like the two worshippers in the temple, or the two house-builders, or the rich man and Lazarus. Jesus never talked abstractly about principles, standards, values; instead, He drew pictures of different attitudes to life. He did not necessarily endorse either of the attitudes thus depicted, but He asked men to think for themselves in the presence of the material presented to them. His parables were meant to stimulate thought, to shock the mind into activity, to prod people into making their own discoveries about God and about themselves.

In the *Journal* of Nathaniel Hawthorne, in which he jotted down ideas for future development, there is this entry: 'Story, the principal personage of which shall always be on the point of entering the scene, but shall never appear.' Is not this the situation we find in many of the parables of our Lord? The *principal personage never appears*. We cannot say that either of the two characters offered for our inspection is a wholly admirable person, worthy of unqualified approval. The real hero of the story is a figure in the background, to be inferred, perhaps the figure of the story-teller Himself.

Both brothers in this particular parable are flawed figures. They are drawn from real life, we immediately recognize them. We have all met 'Sunny Jim,' the pleasant, smiling lad who charms everybody by his desire to please, whose one object in life is to avoid a scene. Such a nice boy, they all say, from his conservative maiden-aunt to his left-wing cousin just down from the 'varsity, because Jim is not so much a person as a mirror faithfully reflecting what people want to see. He rarely raises his voice in protest or gives expression to an unpopular opinion. His bible is 'How to Win Friends and Influence People,' and this means the lavish use of 'sir' and the avoidance of all controversy. But in the end, he goes his own way and does what he intended doing all along—his own will.

In strong contrast is his blunt, rough-tongued brother, who, either because he is busy with his own ploys, or because of some temperamental quirk, finds it much easier to say 'No' than to say 'Yes.' He is always on guard against the invasion of his private life or of his rights, preferring to call no man master. But on mature reflection he often changes his mind, and repents of his boorish behaviour.

We all know the types. But what is the point of drawing them, and holding them up for our scrutiny? Surely not that we should emulate either of them? Neither of the brothers is a

wholly satisfactory character, or an ideal to be followed. What we are given here, then, is not an unambiguous choice between good and bad, but a familiar situation in which we recognize the defects of both attitudes and are quickened into thinking about family relationships on our own account. 'What think ye?'

Certainly, one of these young men was 'better' than the other, and there is no doubt that he obtained the limited approval of Jesus. But it was limited. Obviously if we are shut up to these two alternatives, we must prefer the surly boy who said 'No' and then changed his mind, to the plausible rogue who gave the soft answer that postponed decision. Many years ago Walt Whitman called upon the young men of the new democracy to

Resist much. Obey little

and if he were alive in present-day America, with its cult of conformity (see William L. Whyte's *The Organization Man* or David Reismann's *The Lonely Crowd*), he would undoubtedly be saying the same thing in an even more emphatic voice. There is room in our day for the 'duty of dissent,' a need to hearken to Emerson's words, 'Whoso would be a man must be a nonconformist.' There is something frightening to-day about the eagerness with which the young give their assent to dogmatisms and theological positions which they have not fully scrutinized. As between the over-eager conformist and the person whose instinctive reaction is to guard his own integrity and privacy, there is no doubt about where Christ's vote is given.

But the 'principal personage' in this parable is unquestionably Jesus Himself. He is the true son of the vineyard. It is in Him that men catch sight of the proper response to the Father's word of command—neither glib nor grudging, neither evasive nor reluctant. Not only in this parable but in all His teaching, Jesus' chief concern was to encourage men and women to respond joyfully and eagerly to their heavenly Father, out of deep understanding of His real nature.

1. Both the brothers in this parable show an imperfect understanding of the God with whom we have to do. Both evidently regarded Him as an austere taskmaster, crashing in on their private lives, hence their reluctance to carry out his orders. Yet the command, 'Go work to day in my vineyard,' was issued for their own benefit, for it was they themselves who would reap the fruit. Victor Gollancz, the publisher, speaking of his early religious experience, writes: 'One thing was lacking in me, and without it no true harmony is possible. This was acceptance: not obedience to God's will, for, as you know, I dislike the connotation of "obedience"—a sort of slavishness it implies in the obeyer and a sort of power-mongering in the obeyed—but the freely-given, co-operative acceptance of divine reality: or divine-human reality, for that is the meaning of Christ' (*My Dear Timothy*, 250). Those who heard this parable of Christ could hardly have missed its implications, or missed the contrast between the sons' view of God and the Son's view of Him.

2. Because they did not understand the fatherly intention behind the words of the master of the vineyard, the two brothers had an equally warped attitude to him. Even the 'better' son gave him grudging and joyless obedience. One is reminded of Hilaire Belloc's newly published *Letters*, with their constant refrain: 'I, who have no reward at all, not even an inward one as have most, keep an intellectual regard as for a command.' This is a soldier's creed, unhesitating obedience to an unseen commander-in-chief, rather than a creed of filial love and trust. How different was the attitude of that rare and lovely saint, Florence Allshorn, of whom a friend writes: 'She seems to me consistently to have said Yes to God, and therefore to life. But her answer was never the pious answer that so many of us give, that self-conscious obedience that seems so often to take the colour out of life.' Had Florence Allshorn met these two brothers she would have diagnosed at once what was wrong in their responses; they were both in their different ways egotists. She writes: 'Cut out this self-importance, this egotism, which keeps us small and footbound, and holds us back from giving our true selves their freedom.' It was from the Third Man, Jesus Christ, that she learned this, and therefore her words bite deep into the consciences of us all. 'Many Christians have been shown the first mile of the Christian venture, salvation from sin, but not the second, salvation from egotism . . . the egotism that puts the self before God.'

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Our Link with the Eternal

An Address for Holy Communion

BY THE REVEREND D. H. C. READ, D.D., NEW YORK

'And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.'—1 Jn 5^{11}.

'I love my life,' said a man to me lying in a hospital bed. 'I love all of it—my home, my friends, the countryside, the city, children playing in the street, dogs and kittens, even the noise of new buildings going up. I love it all—and now I'm beginning to say to myself: You're not going

to have it much longer.' This was not a complaint: it was a good, healthy, sensible point of view. We are meant to love life like this, to savour to the full the good things God has given us. I think the best grave-stone inscription I ever saw was in a village in Denmark. It consisted of these words: 'Tak for Alt'—'Thanks for everything.' Isn't that the right note on which to pass the Great Divide?

How can we bring these two thoughts together—that life is good, and that one day, any day, it is going to end? It is in the Christian gospel that these two facts are brought together, and held together in one full and satisfying truth.

That truth is expressed in the words 'eternal life.' Unfortunately this is an expression that for many people has been drained of all meaning. 'Eternal life? You mean the idea that when we die we somehow manage to go on existing somewhere somehow for ever and ever? But it is *this* life I like, and I hate leaving it for some hypothetical non-stop existence out there.'

Suppose we find some other expression to denote what our Bibles call 'eternal life.' After all, these books were not written in English and our words often fail to communicate the real meaning. The Greek word translated 'eternal' describes another *kind* of life, not just a lot more of the same. It is life, as we know it, with something extra to it. How can life have something extra? Well, we would all agree that men and women share life with the animals. Like them we eat and sleep and mate. But we have this common life plus something extra. Locate it where you will—in the power of thought, or speech, or conscious creation—there is an extra to human life, unknown to the animals. Then why can there not be a possible extra to ordinary human life, that which is not bound to the limitations of time and space? This is the quality we are thinking about. Instead of 'eternal life' let us call it 'Life-plus.'

Where is this Life-plus to be found and how do we get hold of it?

There is a plain answer in the Bible, and it is backed by the conviction and experience of the entire Christian Church. 'And this is the record, that God hath given to us "life-plus," and this life is in His Son.'

'God has given us Life-plus.' Eternal life, to use the familiar expression, is then something that we possess *now* if we are believers, right here and now another world is pressing in upon us, the world of God. And to live in that world is to have Life-plus. It means to be awake to the world of God while living in the world of men—more than that, it is to realize that the *true* world of men is the world of God. We can learn to see our daily life, not just in the dull dimensions of time and space, but with the stereoscopic vision of eternity.

Only then can we begin to see why the Christian can truly love and be thankful for the life that now surrounds us, while calmly accepting the brute fact of death. What matters is not so much that we try to convince ourselves that there is a heaven to come, as that we strengthen these ties that bind to the heaven that is here. For the more really and genuinely we know Life-plus as a present experience the more surely do we draw the sting from death.

In the last great act of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* the Queen prepares for the end. Decked in the symbols of her former glory she awaits a world where they have little worth:

> Give me my robe, put on my crown; I have
> Immortal longings in me.

Deep within each one of us there is the knowledge that we were not born for death. McNeil Dickson in his book, *The Human Situation*, speaks of these 'immortal longings' as being in themselves an indication that they can find fulfilment, and draws a comparison with the life of the womb: 'As in the darkness, in the organism not yet born, the eye is formed to correspond to things invisible, and thus with confidence anticipates a world to come, so the soul's faculties, for love, for joy, for admiration, for achievement, correspond to a reality which exists, and is by them foretold. The soul does not provide itself with a passport for an imaginary country, and cannot vibrate to a note unsounded by the universe.'

When we are most truly living by the best we know, where are our deepest joys in life? Are they in the passing pleasures of possession? Are they not rather located in the love we have known, the beauty we have experienced, the truth we have discovered?

Yes; God has given us this Life-plus here and now, and the more fully we receive it, the surer and calmer will be our approach to the moment when we shall not have 'all this.' For the Christian, then, it is not simply a question of 'All this—and heaven too' but 'All this—with heaven in it *now*.'

Yes; there are sufficient 'intimations of immortality' to throw a transforming light on this daily life of ours, but God's gift to us goes further. If Life-plus is really life with God, then we do well to seek the strongest ties with Him. That is why we create a pool of silence in these throbbing lives where we pray and worship, both alone and together as a family of believers. When we truly worship we know that the eternal world is meeting us in the life of every day. And when we reach the supreme secret of the Christian faith we realize that God Himself, the eternal God, has made the supreme and final link between our life and His.

For 'this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son.*' This, for the Christian, is the supreme link here and now with the eternal. In the words of His last great prayer: 'This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.'

To know Christ now is to have this Life-plus, and so to know Christ now is to know Him then—when this mortal heart has ceased to beat and our eyes open on another and richer world. Of all the links that must now be strengthened this is the most vital. 'What if this present were the world's last night?' cries John Donne,

Mark in my heart, O Soul, where thou dost dwell,
The picture of Christ crucified . . .

There is no other that can so confer upon us the assurance of eternity, a Life-plus that begins right now and passes on beyond into the fullness of that life to come. For in Him is the Divine compassion that meets us now and will welcome us then.

Here is a simple substance from this world of time and space, a symbol of the life we love—a piece of bread. By God's mercy it becomes to us the living Body of His Christ, the living link with life eternal. 'This is the bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.' To eat the bread and drink the wine of the Lord's Supper in simple faith and trust is to be given the pledge of life eternal, for it is to receive Christ, our living and eternal link with God.

And so, from communion with the everyday we come into communion with the eternal, where our dead are alive in God, an eternal that speaks even now in the love and truth and beauty that surround us, and shines triumphant in the face of Jesus Christ. 'All this' we cannot have for long. Him we can have for ever.

Here, O my Lord, I see Thee face to face;
Here would I touch and handle things unseen,
Here grasp with firmer hand the eternal grace,
And all my weariness upon Thee lean.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Message of Harvest-Tide

BY THE VERY REVEREND GEORGE JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, D.D., GLASGOW

'The harvest truly is great.'—Lk 10^2.

It is comforting to think that Jesus knew how to temper the white-heat intensity of His soul with the calming influence of Nature. It is significant that a life spent amid much human sorrow and which was to end on a Cross had in it the leisureliness that could revel in the perennial pageantry of the seasons. It is not too much to say that there are countless people on whom God's wondrous gifts in the beauties of Nature are utterly lost. This is true of the worldling. In a novel I read lately there occurred this mordant sentence regarding one whose life was bulging with material success. 'There were flowers around his feet and he had no objection to them and there were stars above his head but they had no commercial value!' But a similar judgment might often be passed on some reputed saints. A perfervid Spanish mystic has written these lines:

Now on no creature can I turn my sight
But on my Maker all my mind is set.
Earth, sea and sky are emptied of delight
For Christ's dear love all else I clean forget.

On such asceticism I would pass, with all reverence, the opinion that here is one attempting to be holier than Christ Himself. For our Lord, earth, sea, and sky were *thrillingly full of delight.* When He invited His over-driven disciples to come apart and rest awhile I venture to think that they filled the welcome space not with the intensities of the spirit but with the song of the birds and the glories of the over-arching sky. James Denney has a wholesome word for all who tend to become unhealthily introspective. 'It would be an immense enrichment of worship in many churches if they abridged their hymn-books in which personal religion has run mad and praised God oftener in the great Nature Psalms.' So let us follow our Lord not, on this occasion, into the temple or even into the secret place, but into God's great Out-of-doors and share with Him some of His divine intuitions as He gazed on the golden sheaves.

Surely these spoke to Him of *His Father's eternal faithfulness.* He must often have comforted Himself with the words that stand written for man's immemorial trust—'While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.' To the mind of our Lord a thing was no less a miracle because it happened every day or every year. Some of us need Emerson's timely reminder—'If the stars came out but once in a thousand years how men would gasp and stare!' And some of us need to have a few experiences of the utter failure of a harvest to be jolted out of the complacency with which we take for granted the perennial mystery of God's faithfulness. How wonderful it would be if we could recapture the magic of the words with which Jesus cooled the feverish worries of those burdened with fears of an unprovided future. 'Behold the fowls of the air. God feedeth them. Consider the lilies of the

field. God sustains them. If you can count on God's constancy in Nature, He seems to say, can you not count on God's faithfulness in the realm of grace?' And what is behind this faithfulness of God in the matter of our soul's growth? Perhaps a clue to it may be found in a verse in James which Moffatt translates thus—'*He yearns jealously for the spirit He set within us.*' Such a thought calls up in my mind a picture from the past. From the window of my study in a southern manse I used to look over the street on a human scene. It was a greenhouse so small that you could hardly swing in it the proverbial cat. But it was a veritable Temple of Yearning. The owner of it—a retired railway guard—would stand for hours, smoking his pipe and watching with joyous solicitude the growth of his few tomatoes and geraniums. In the same line of thought one recalls the words spoken of an Oxford Professor—'that he never ceased to wonder at the smallness of the seed of knowledge in a student's mind that so often led to a great scholar's career.' It is exhilarating to think that the root of God's faithfulness towards His children is that He yearns jealously, wondrously, patiently, hopefully for the fruition of the spirit that He sets within the poorest of us. Can we co-operate with this Divine hopefulness and sing from our hearts

A hope so great, and so divine,
may trials well endure;
And purge the soul from sense and sin,
as Christ himself is pure.

Again, our Lord put alongside the assurance of God's faithfulness *the necessity for man's patience.* There is one perfect gem among His parables whose lustre has suffered from the greater effulgence of another—the Parable of the Sower. It is the brief parable, known—not too aptly—as 'the seed growing secretly.' Perhaps for our comfort, a better name would be 'the seed growing slowly.' It is a tranquillizing invitation to us—having done the little that human effort can accomplish and with the experience of countless harvests to teach us—to 'quietly wait' for the awakening and unfolding of that which God alone can perform. Great is the mystery of growth. No wonder Christ spoke so often about seed. He would look on a few seeds and say

Here in their safe and simple house of death
Sealed in their shells a million roses leap.
Here I can blow a garden with my breath
And in my hand a forest lies asleep.

No one had a better right to speak of the spiritual significance of seed than Jesus Himself. He has one mighty parable for the impatient. It is the Parable of the Mustard Seed. Into the soil of the world's history He planted a seed which was to germinate and become the greatest Kingdom known to men. He left in the precarious keeping of a few simple men the whole future of His divine mission, and looked over the centuries to its miraculous fulfilment. In His heart of hearts He felt that evil, however temporarily triumphant, always carried within it the seeds of its own destruction and, conversely, that good, however seemingly impotent, carried within it the seeds of its own propagation. So He could flash His eye from one end of time to the other and say serenely to all who followed Him—'In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.' Let us bring something of this great confident patience into our own lives and in due season we shall reap if we faint not.

It is good to think that *Jesus must often have been present at Harvest-Home rejoicings.* And He sees to it that interspersed with our misgivings and defeats there are great red-letter days when we are made to feel that not only is the Christian life infinitely worth-while but there is no other to be compared with it. In every walk of life it is good to hear of such days. Lord Macaulay toiled for long tedious years over his great *History of England* and at last the day came when he received a cheque for twenty thousand pounds. 'But that,' he noted in his diary, 'was a harvest-day.' So God gives to many men such rewarding days. The Headmaster, often dubious of the fruit of his labours through the years, has such a day when some pupil who has splendidly 'made good' returns to his public school to return thanks for his teacher's influence. For long seasons in the ministry we toil on and it looks like beating the air or ploughing the sand. But the day comes when someone, battered and bruised by the hard blows of life, is good enough to write and tell us how some poor word of ours has been to him worth more than much fine gold. To all who in humility of heart, in purity of motive, in fervour of mind spend themselves for the good of their fellows there will come both here and in a life 'beyond all hope of telling wonderful' the fulfilment of the promise 'He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him.'

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Sign of Cana [1]

'Thou hast kept the good wine until now.'—Jn 2^{10}.

Every one who knows the story of Christ has heard about the wedding at Cana in Galilee—not

[1] Alec R. Vidler, *Windsor Sermons*, 66 ff. This volume is reviewed in the Literature section—*Editor.*

only has heard about it, but likes it. It shows He was no kill-joy. Yes, but unfortunately that is not what the story means; at least, that is not why it is included in the Gospel.

Mind you, I do not doubt that God approves and countenances social festivities: but that is not the point of this story. When the evangelist has told the story, he does not end up by saying: 'So you see the Lord blesses weddings and approves of the domestic virtues and the natural pleasures of hearth and home.' Not at all: what he says at the end of the story is this: 'This beginning of his *signs* did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.' He says it is a sign, an indication of the Lord's glory. Then it points beyond itself to something else; there is more in it than meets the eye.

And, after all, if you have looked upon it as a simple, straightforward story of a wedding party—told with no ulterior motive or motif—has it not struck you that there are some queer things about it?

To begin with, why is this episode, which is said to have made so great an impression on the disciples, recorded only in one of the Gospels, only in the last and latest of the Gospels? Now we know that St. John's Gospel contains a lot of mysterious symbolism, and that should prepare us for the possibility that in the case of the wedding at Cana the evangelist has taken hold of a story he had heard somewhere about Jesus at a wedding feast and has told it so as to illustrate or enforce the theme of his book which, as he says at the end, he wrote in order 'that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in His name.'

And there is another difficulty. Jesus is said to have changed into wine the water in six stone jars, 'containing two or three firkins apiece.' That means a total quantity of about a hundred and twenty gallons! David Strauss, the author of a famous Life of Jesus which George Eliot translated into English about a hundred years ago, and which shocked our ancestors, described this as a 'miracle of luxury'; and wasn't he justified? Is this the sort of miracle that Jesus really performed? It is not the impression we get from the other Gospels. And anyhow the Fourth Gospel does not call it a 'miracle' (the so-called Authorized Version is at fault there) but a 'sign.' It should be read more as a parable than as a miracle.

Consider then what the story means understood as a sign, as pointing to something beyond itself. In the previous chapter the evangelist has made this declaration which he regards as of very great moment: 'The law was given through Moses: grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.' And now he is trying to show what the difference is like between 'the law' on the one hand and 'grace and truth' on the other.

Judaism, the Law of Moses, the Torah, though it had real good in it (remember, they had had some wine to start with)—Judaism had issued in a barren and depressing legal system.

So, the water and the six waterpots (note the imperfect number) which were used for legal purification, represent the old order of things, which Jesus, who is God's agent in the new creation, transforms into wine. 'Wine that maketh glad the heart of man.' Jesus came not like John the Baptist baptizing with water, but baptizing with the Holy Spirit: the Holy Spirit who sets men free from the strain and stress of trying to make themselves virtuous, and enables them to rejoice in the overflowing generosity of God. The two things are as different as wine is from water.

Notice that when Jesus says, 'Mine hour is not yet come,' there is more in His words than lies on the surface: else it would be a curiously solemn way of speaking. 'His hour had not yet come.' This is a phrase that sounds through St. John's Gospel like a refrain, almost like a tolling bell. 'His hour' means the hour of His death, the hour when He is to be lifted up so as to draw all men unto Him: the hour when He is to be glorified and so to be able to release the Holy Spirit who is to be the source and spring of new life for all men. This new life can be given only as a result of the laying down of His own life in death. In that sense 'his hour had not yet come,' but it was impending, and for the readers of the Gospel it had already come.

And now what about the great quantity of wine provided by Jesus, so far exceeding what could be immediately needed. This is no longer a difficulty; for it represents, it symbolizes, the glorious abundance of the new life which the Christ brings and gives. 'I am come,' He says, 'that they might have life, and may have it *abundantly*.'

But granted that the wedding at Cana is a sign, a sign of Christ's transforming the Law into grace and truth, what has that to do with us now? For we are Christians, aren't we? and not Jews: we are not under the Law but under the Gospel. Don't you be too sure! There are multitudes of people in Christendom, or in what is left of it, and not least in England—I suspect it is true of all of us in some degree—who think that serving God means keeping the Law. I don't mean the Law of Moses—people do not think much about that, perhaps not as much as they should—but the Moral Law. They think the highest aim a man can have is to live according to the Moral Law or to live up to the Moral Ideal. There is nothing

more depressing or more frustrating than trying to live up to an ideal or than trying to be good—I mean very good. That is why so many good people are so depressed—and so depressing. You see, one of two things usually happens. Either you keep your Ideal before you in its majesty and in all the rigour of its demands—and then you are frustrated because you never come anywhere near to living up to it; or, because that is intolerable, you bring your Ideal down to a nice, respectable way of life which you can quite comfortably manage, but then all the savour, all the colour, all the glory have gone out of it. You may have plenty of water, but you have no wine.

There is all the difference in the world between trying to be good and rejoicing in the generosity of God—in the grace and truth that came through Jesus Christ. It is the difference between being moral and living in the Spirit. Many people know the difference and have experienced life in the Spirit, without knowing or acknowledging that Christ is the author of this new creation. It was upon all flesh that the Lord promised to pour out His Spirit, and not only upon such flesh as had been correctly packed and labelled by the Church.

In this chapel,[1] we have very little excuse for trying to be good, with all the self-consciousness that that entails. But we have every reason and every motive for rejoicing in the generosity of God. For the evidences of His generosity surround us here and speak to us on every side; and they all bear the name of the author of the new creation who has kept the good wine until now—the name that is above every name: and now to His name and to the name of the Father and of the Holy Ghost be ascribed all honour, might, dominion, and majesty, henceforth and for evermore.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Is the Christian Life more Exacting than Satisfying?

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR A. COWAN, D.D., EDINBURGH

'What profit is it that we have kept his ordinance?'—Mal 3^{14}.

'He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.'—He 11^{6}.

It is sometimes supposed that the Christian way of living does not fulfil its promise. Is it more exacting than satisfying?

Look at the Sceptical Question. 'What profit is it that we have kept his ordinance?' A granddaughter of Charles Darwin, in her entertaining account of his family, tells how she was brought up with a father and five uncles who all considered religion so much mumbo-jumbo from which nothing of value is to be gained. She confesses that when she went to school she enjoyed being regarded by the other girls as a shocking heretic, and she gives her point of view: 'From my earliest childhood I knew very well that Being Good did not pay.' She concluded that attachment to the highest did not give any advantage in life and did not put one in a stronger and happier position. A similar conclusion is voiced by people when they feel they have been let down by their sense of Christian obligation. 'It is a thankless job!' a devoted mother or daughter or church-worker may exclaim. 'I've been a fool to do so much and give up so much because I felt it my duty; and now nothing worthwhile has come of it.' 'What profit is it that we have kept his ordinance?' What profit indeed, if there is no return for the self-outlay?

This misgiving has increased with the new uncertainty about God due to the latest scientific discoveries. The Creator of the terrific energy in the atom and the deadly possibility in nuclear power must be an adventurous God, who likes to take risks and enjoys living dangerously. Perhaps people had overlooked God's fearlessness in becoming incarnate in a defenceless child and in allowing the Crucifixion and the fearlessness of Jesus' character till science forced their minds to recognize this neglected aspect of God. Anyhow, it is disconcerting to those who wish a safe, comfortable religion. Is not the Christian life likely to be more exacting than satisfying when Providence is so incalculable? How can we have confidence in a God who is so daring? 'Our Father which art in heaven'! Strange to be told that God is love and that we are all very dear to Him, when He trusts erring, sinful humans with so much freedom amid explosive material and potential horror! Would any good parent allow his inquisitive children to roam at large among T.N.T. and does not the Divine Parent leave too much to chance? So the sceptical question arises: 'What profit is it that we have kept his ordinance?' But this is unfair criticism of God, because God never leaves us at liberty amid destructive forces without providing danger signals and deterrents which are difficult to overcome. 'Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me' with protective mercy. Yet there are minds which surmise that such a dauntless God is a questionable quantity whom they are afraid to trust, as He might go too far for them. How could they rely on such a startling adventurer as God to do justice to their prayers and endeavours? This is the

[1] St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

suspicion that service of the God revealed in Christ is more exacting than satisfying, more costly than rewarding. It may account for the very cautious and limited help that some people give to the Church and may explain their fear of doing too much, lest they should lose more than they gain.

Now look at the Reassuring Answer to the Sceptical Question. 'What profit is it that we have kept his ordinance?' The query of doubt is not the end of the story. 'He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' If we are noticing at all, we recognize that God gives far more than He receives and that His magnificent bounty dwarfs our meagre devotion. It is true that God is adventurous and unpredictable, and therefore vital religion is never boring and tiresome, but always has the plot-interest of God beckoning us to come on and discover the great things He can do for us and what He has prepared for those who love Him. According to Dean Inge, 'the spiritual life is a grand experiment which ends in an experience; but it is not merely a leap in the dark; throughout its whole course there is a progressive verification of its fundamental hypothesis, which makes us quite sure we are on the right road.' This reassures us that God does not fall short of our expectations in the end, does not leave us with the feeling that we have been strained, perhaps even distressed, in His service without reaching any satisfying result, but keeps troth with the faithful spirit and sees it through to a worthy conclusion.

> Art thou afraid his pow'r shall fail
> when comes thy evil day?

We need not be afraid. 'He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.'

What is the reward that makes the Christian life finally more satisfying than exacting? By our Christian devotion we earn the right to respect ourselves and are not afraid to be alone with our own thoughts, because we are not tormented by reproachful memories or accusing recollections. If the page of our life is blotted here and there—and we are all sinful creatures—we know that we are so greatly loved by God that Jesus Christ died to remove the guilt complex, to make us sure of the Divine forgiveness and to give us a fresh start and an undying power of repair. Here is part of the reward which far exceeds the cost of the Christian life. Further, the devoted spirit has not only new responsibilities but also new resources which give him increased adequacy. No longer is he

> In amplitude of dreams a god,
> A slave in dearth of power.

He is twice the man he was before, so spiritually reinforced that he has escaped the humiliation of being feckless, never getting any further on. A new moral dynamism is the paramount gift of the gospel. The Divine strength imparted is another way in which God rewards them that diligently seek Him. Further, when people get outside of themselves in service and enjoy the adventurous God, exult in Him, abandon themselves to Him, there is an enlargement of life which brings new delight and zest. The small, shut-in existence of egotism is left behind amid these bigger dimensions of love where human personality is fulfilled, and people grow up to their best. Here is a blithe reward indeed.

'He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' Ernest Renan wrote in his *Philosophical Dialogues*: 'As for myself, I should like two things—first, that my sacrifices to goodness and to truth should not have been offered up to blank and empty space. (I do not want to be repaid for them, but I want them to fulfil some purpose.) And, secondly, that what little I have done should meet with somebody's acknowledgment. I want God's esteem, nothing more. This is exorbitant, is it? Do we reproach the dying soldier with taking an interest in the issue of the battle and wishing to know whether his Commander-in-chief is pleased with him?' Renan's words may be criticized in that a sacrifice to goodness and truth may be a sacrifice of the lower self, but is a satisfaction of the higher self, a fulfilment of the best in human personality. But a man is entitled to some assurance that his devotion will not be a futile self-expenditure, a waste of time, thought and energy. Jesus Christ gives him the desired assurance of God's approval: 'Well done, good and faithful servant!' And again, 'Come ye blessed of my Father.' Jesus Christ also gives him the longed-for assurance about the issue of the battle: 'Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.' In our own time John Macmurray concludes that the triumph of Christianity in human affairs must be regarded as certain. 'Since God is absolute,' he says, 'it is nonsensical to think that His intention in history will not be realized.' This is the good news that God is not going to turn out our supreme disappointment but our supreme deliverance. True, the Kingdom of God can only be consummated beyond this world, but it can advance in this world, and the victorious prospects of the Christian cause should convince us that though God is adventurous He has not abdicated. It should rally our confidence in Him as the God who reigns, who is the bona fide sovereign of human destiny. It gives us brighter hopes for the future, and guarantees that the Christian life is more satisfying than exacting, because God is the 'rewarder of them that diligently seek him.'

Entre Nous

A Preacher on Preaching

People who are experts both in theory and in practice are rare. For one man who can *show* us how to do it there are a hundred men who can *tell* us how to do it. The great characteristic of Dr. W. E. Sangster is that he is a master of both the theory and the practice of preaching. In his new book, *Power in Preaching* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), he has put all preachers still further in his debt.

Dr. Sangster is fully aware of the difficulty of the present situation. He quotes certain facts given by Admiral Sir Geoffrey Layton in a speech at Portsmouth. A simple examination in religious knowledge was set to young men joining the Navy. They were a fair cross-section of the population, if anything of rather higher than average intelligence. Only twenty-three per cent. could repeat the Lord's Prayer accurately; twenty-eight per cent. knew it in part; forty-nine per cent. knew no more than the opening words. Seventy-two per cent. knew who Jesus Christ was, but only thirty-nine per cent. knew where He was born. What happened on Good Friday was known to sixty-two per cent., but only forty-five per cent. knew about Easter, and only one man in forty could explain Whitsuntide. There is the situation.

Dr. Sangster enumerates six different kinds of preaching—Bible Interpretation, Ethical and Devotional, Doctrinal, Philosophic and Apologetic, Social, Evangelistic. But he is open-eyed to the faults in present-day preaching. 'A Christian man talking in a pulpit with an open Bible in front of him is not necessarily preaching the gospel.' 'All the evidence goes to show that a great deal of Protestant preaching for a generation past has been on marginal things.' An anonymous layman in a letter to *The Times Literary Supplement* said that British preaching on the whole was 'too scanty and did not strike deep enough'. The danger is that preachers attempt 'the impossible task of making a staple diet out of sugary trifles.' The topical sermon has its dangers. In his day there were those who superciliously smiled on Archbishop Leighton because he refused to be topical in the temporary sense of the word. 'Surely,' he answered, 'when all of you are preaching up the times, you may allow one poor brother to preach up Christ and eternity.'

Dr. Sangster recalls men to the great purposes of preaching: 'Here, then, is the preacher's task: to preach about God, to show man his own real nature, to expose sin, to announce the way of salvation, to stagger people with the truth of the Incarnation, to hold up in a hundred ways the truth of the Atonement, to tell of the work of the Holy Spirit, and to proclaim all the refinements of grace.' One of the great failures of preaching is to answer the question *how*? 'A preacher should hold steadily before himself the ambition of sending away all his hearers saying quietly to themselves: "This is what I have to do".' Even the greatest things must be stated with clarity. Dr. Sangster recalls how John Wesley re-formed his preaching after his heart was strangely warmed. He took his sermons and preached them to a simple servant girl before he preached them to any congregation. He told her to stop him when he said anything which she did not understand. His sermons became a mass of alterations and erasures, but they became such that the simplest person could understand. In the end power is generated by great belief. Such great belief 'can make the stammerer fluent—and sometimes make the over-fluent stammer.'

Dr. Sangster never forgets that prayer is the dynamic at the back of all great preaching. He tells of the negro preacher who said that he 'read himself full', then 'thought himself clear', and finally 'prayed himself hot', indeed an ideal recipe for preaching.

Just sometimes Dr. Sangster's impatience with what he regards as petty questions is not altogether justified. He writes: 'Speculations were raised concerning unimportant people who flit across the Bible record. Who was the young man who followed Jesus out of Gethsemane and then fled naked from the scene (Mk 14^{51-52})—as if it mattered either way.' Surely it matters, for, if that young man was Mark, then the story of Gethsemane is an eye-witness account, and where else did the account come from, if the disciples slept? Sometimes his impatience with the lack of lucidity takes him too far. 'If the teaching is so abstruse that it simply cannot be made plain to plain people, it may be doubted whether it belongs to the Gospel once delivered to the saints.' There is truth there—but it is dangerous doctrine, for there is nothing so perilous as over-simplification.

Any preacher will rise from the reading of this book humbled, challenged, abashed and inspired—and that is exactly the effect a book on preaching should have.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.